This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 2044 009 631 318

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

<50

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
FEB 6 [illegible]

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE EARLY ROMAN HISTORY

BY THE RIGHT HON.

SIR GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
FEB 6 1989

LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.
1855.

~~AH 7298.55 (1)~~

AH 7298.55 (1)

HARVARD
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
DEC 18 1957

> Ibant obscuri solâ sub nocte per umbram.
> Quale per incertam lunam sub luce malignâ
> Est iter in silvis; ubi cœlum condidit umbrâ
> Jupiter, et rebus nox abstulit atra colorem.
>
> ÆNEID, vi. 268.

TO THE

REV. EDWARD CRAVEN HAWTREY, D.D.,

PROVOST OF ETON COLLEGE,

THESE VOLUMES,

DEVOTED TO THE INVESTIGATION OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY,

Are Inscribed,

IN MEMORY OF THE BENEFITS DERIVED FROM
HIS INSTRUCTION,

BY HIS OBLIGED FRIEND AND FORMER PUPIL,

THE AUTHOR.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
FEB 6 19[illegible]

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction.

§ 1 Treatment of Roman history during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries . . . . p. 1

2 First appearances of scepticism respecting the early Roman history. First, Cluverius, Bochart, and Perizonius; afterwards, M. de Pouilly, and Louis de Beaufort 4

3 Roman history of Niebuhr; his historical method 9

4 Treatment of Roman history since Niebuhr; conflicting views of the different writers 12

5 Object of the present work, to examine the external evidences of the early Roman history 15

CHAPTER II.

On the Sources of the Roman History during the last two Centuries of the Republic.

§ 1 Contemporary writers of Roman history during the last period of the Republic—Cicero, Julius Cæsar, Sallust, Livy, and others 19

2 Contemporary historians of the times of Marius and Sylla: Sylla, Q. Lutatius Catulus, P. Rutilius Rufus, M. Æmilius Scaurus, L. Otacilius Pilitus, C. Licinius Macer, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, Q. Valerius Antias, Cn. Aufidius, L. Cornelius Sisenna, L. Lucullus, L. Lucceius 22

3 Contemporary historians of the age of the Gracchi: P. Sempronius Asellio, Cn. Gellius, L. Cælius Antipater, C. Sempronius Tuditanus, C. Fannius, L. Cassius Hemina, L. Calpurnius Piso 27

4 Contemporary Greek writers of Roman history during the later period of the Republic: Juba, Strabo, Posidonius, Polybius, —C. Acilius Glabrio, a Roman, wrote in Greek 31

§ 5 Contemporary historians of the next period: M. Porcius Cato, Posidonius, Scipio Africanus the First, Scipio Nasica, P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus . . . . p. 34
6 Earliest contemporary native historians: L. Cincius Alimentus, Q. Fabius Pictor 36
7 Greek contemporary writers of the Punic wars: Silenus, Sosilus, Philinus 39
8 Character of the contemporary historians of Rome during this period: they were trustworthy reporters of facts, but had little literary or philosophical merit 40
9 The work of Livy was to a great extent a history of his own time 44
10 Other contemporary sources of history during the same period: public speeches, official records, laws 47
11 Copious authentic materials for the history of the last two centuries of the Republic extant in antiquity 49
12 Historical poems of Ennius, Accius, Hostius, and Nævius . . 54
13 Earliest points of contact between Greek and Roman history: Italian expedition of Pyrrhus; embassy of Ptolemy Philadelphus to Rome; expeditions of Archidamus III., Alexander king of Epirus, and Cleonymus to Italy 56
14 Early ignorance of the Greeks respecting Rome 58
15 As soon as the Romans came in contact with the Greeks, they were included in the Greek contemporary history 64
16 Although the original contemporary historians of the last two centuries of the Republic have perished, their accounts have been preserved in the secondary histories which have come down to us 67

CHAPTER III.

On the Sources of Roman History, for the Period before the War with Pyrrhus.

(753—281 B.C.)

§ 1 A received narrative of the events of the first 472 years of Rome was extant in antiquity 70
2 Extant historical writers, by whom it has been preserved: Livy, Dionysius, Florus, Eutropius, Orosius, the works *De Origine Gentis Romanæ*, and *De Viris Illustribus Urbis Romæ*, Diodorus, Plutarch, Appian, Dio Cassius, and Zonaras . . 71

§ 3 Indirect sources of information respecting the early history . p. 75
4 Universal belief in the received narrative of the early history in the later period of the Republic 76
5 The received narrative of the early history was formed by the historians before Dionysius and Livy . . . . ib.
6 Inquiry proposed, as to the materials from which they formed this narrative 77
7 Q. Fabius Pictor, and L. Cincius Alimentus, the two earliest Roman historians: their means of obtaining authentic information respecting the early history 78
8 Cato, as a writer of ancient history 85
9 Subsequent historians of the early period 88
10 Recent date of the writers who composed the early history of Rome . . . . ib.
11 Meaning of the term *annales*, as applied to the works of the ancient Roman historians 90
12 Hieronymus, Timæus, and other Greek historians, as authorities for the early Roman history 94
13 Difference between Greek and Roman historiography . . . 96

CHAPTER IV.

On the Oral Traditions of Roman History, for the Period before the War with Pyrrhus.

§ 1 Ordinary period for the preservation of events by oral tradition 98
2 Special circumstances by which this period might be extended; commemorative festivals, anniversaries 101
3 Memorials of the regal period 102
4 Written laws, as a nucleus of oral traditions 112
5 Oral traditions respecting constitutional history 113
6 Oral traditions respecting ancient Italian ethnology 127
7 Inquiry proposed as to written sources of information accessible to the earliest historians of the first five centuries 132

CHAPTER V.

On the Public Records and Memorials of the Roman State, for the Period before the War with Pyrrhus.

§ 1 Official scribes of the Romans 134
2 Official documents preserved by magistrates 136

§ 3 Official depositories . . . . p. 137
4 Laws engraved on brass 138
5 Ancient laws: leges regiæ 139
6 Custody of senatus-consulta 142
7 Preservation of treaties . . . . *ib.*
8 Other ancient inscriptions 147
9 Casualties from fire and other causes to which ancient documents were exposed 148
10 Destruction of Roman archives in the Gallic conflagration . . 151
11 The annals kept by the pontifex maximus 153
12 The books of the pontiffs 169
13 Records of the names of the annual magistrates 172

CHAPTER VI.

On the Private Memorials, and Historical Poems of Rome, for the Period before the War with Pyrrhus.

§ 1 Deliberative speeches 178
2 Funeral orations, and inscriptions for ancestorial images . . . 180
3 Family-histories and memoirs 190
4 Histories of neighbouring states: chronicles of Cumæ, and Præneste; Sabine, Etruscan, and Massilian chronicles . . . 197
5 Popular poems: hypothesis of Niebuhr examined 202

CHAPTER VII.

On the Treatment of the Early Roman History by the Extant Historians of Antiquity.

§ 1 Essential characteristic of the history of the first 4½ centuries of Rome, that it was not derived from the writings of contemporary historians 243
2 Historical character of Dionysius: he reproduced with substantial fidelity the traditionary history of the first 4½ centuries 245
3 Historical character of Livy: his treatment of the early history 247
4 Speeches in Dionysius and Livy 256
5 Knowledge of Dionysius and Livy with respect to the early constitution of Rome 262
6 Example of Livy's documentary accuracy 263

§ 7 General result, that the history of the first 4½ centuries of Rome cannot be traced to the testimony of credible and ascertainable witnesses . . . . p. 264
8 Examination of the evidences of Roman history, in six successive periods, ending with the war of Pyrrhus, proposed . . 266

CHAPTER VIII.

On the Primitive History of the Nations of Italy.

§ 1 National origin of the Romans: uncertainty of early ethnology 267
2 Earliest inhabitants of the Roman territory: the Siceli; the Aborigines; the Pelasgians 272
3 Tyrrhenians, Tyrrhenian Pelasgians, Etruscans 281
4 Arcadian colony to Rome under Evander 283
5 Expedition of Hercules to Italy 288
6 Unhistorical nature of the accounts of the primitive ethnology of Italy 294

CHAPTER IX.

Æneas in Italy.

§ 1 Primitive line of Italian kings: Saturn, Picus, Faunus, and Latinus 298
2 Æneas settles in Italy, and marries the daughter of Latinus . 300
3 Greek legends respecting the returns of the heroes from Troy . 301
4 Various accounts respecting the migration of Æneas from Troy 303
5 Legends respecting the presence of Æneas in various parts of Greece 307
6 Æneas in Southern Italy, Sicily, and Carthage 314
7 Æneas on the Western coast of Italy 323
8 Landing of Æneas at Laurentum on the coast of Latium: legends relating to the presence of Ulysses in Italy and Sicily 326
9 Æneas in Latium; his settlement at Lavinium, and marriage with Lavinia; and his wars 331
10 His death: and his tombs 339
11 Early recognition of the Trojan colony in Latium 341
12 The legend of Æneas in Latium mainly owing to the influence of the Homeric poems 342
13 The voyage of Æneas to Italy is unhistorical 344

CHAPTER X.

The Alban Kingdom and the Foundation of Rome.

§ 1 Ascanius, or Iulus, the son of Æneas, succeeds him as king of Lavinium: he founds Alba Longa, and transfers the kingdom to it . . . . p. 352
2 Line of the Alban kings from Ascanius to Numitor 356
3 Chronology of the Alban kings 367
4 The accounts of the Alban kings are unhistorical 369
5 The Alban kings were derived from popular legends, and were not a forgery of recent historians 372
6 Accounts of the foundation of Rome: received foundation legend of Romulus and Remus 376
7 Other foundation legends of Rome 394
8 Unhistorical nature of the legend of Romulus and Remus, and of the other foundation legends of Rome 401
9 Indigenous origin and ancient national acceptance of the legend of Romulus and Remus 405

CHAPTER XI.

The Seven Kings of Rome.

PART I.—THE REIGNS OF ROMULUS, NUMA, TULLUS HOSTILIUS, AND ANCUS MARCIUS.

§ 1 753—717 B.C. Political acts of Romulus, after the foundation of Rome: division of the people into tribes and curiæ, and into patricians and plebeians: creation of the Senate: institution of the Celeres: functions of the king: military divisions: colonial system: religious institutes: laws on private relations 411
2 The asylum; the rape of the Sabine women 419
3 Wars of Romulus with Cænina, Antemnæ, and Crustumerium; origin of the spolia opima, and the triumph 421
4 War of Titus Tatius and the Sabines against Rome: story of Tarpeia: Mettus Curtius 422
5 Peace is made through the interposition of the Sabine matrons 426
6 Joint rule of Romulus and Tatius. Death of Tatius 428

§ 7 Romulus again sole king: he defeats the Veientes, and takes the Septem pagi . . . . p. 429
8 Death of Romulus . . . . *ib.*
9 Character of the accounts respecting the reign of Romulus. . 431
10 716 B.C. Interregal government after the death of Romulus 442
11 715—673 B.C. Election of Numa as king 445
12 Religious institutions of Numa: his relations with Egeria . 446
13 Death of Numa: ideal and unhistorical character of his reign: he is called the disciple of Pythagoras 448
14 673—642 B.C. Tullus Hostilius is elected king 453
15 War between Rome and Alba: battle of the Horatii and Curiatii 454
16 Demolition of Alba. Sabine and Latin wars 458
17 Death of Tullus Hostilius 460
18 Examination of the accounts of the reign of Tullus Hostilius 461
19 641—617 B.C. Ancus Marcius is elected king: his wars and public works 465

PART II.—THE REIGNS OF TARQUINIUS PRISCUS, SERVIUS TULLIUS, AND TARQUINIUS SUPERBUS.

20 616—579 B.C. Etruscan origin of Lucius Tarquinius: he settles at Rome, and is elected king: his wars: he adopts the Etruscan insignia of empire 470
21 His public works: his political measures. Legend of Attus Navius 474
22 Death of Tarquinius Priscus. 476
23 Character of the accounts respecting Tarquinius Priscus . . 477
24 Gallic migration reported to have taken place during his reign 479
25 578—535 B.C. Birth of Servius Tullius: he becomes king: irregular mode of his appointment 482
26 Political measures of Servius: his alteration of the tribes and institution of pagi 487
27 His division of classes, and his census. 489
28 Examination of the accounts respecting the Servian institution of classes 496
29 League of Servius with the Latins: his temples of Fortune: his military exploits 502
30 Death of Servius: He is killed by his son-in-law, L. Tarquinius: his daughter Tullia drives over his dead body 503
31 Character of the accounts of the reign of Servius Tullius . . 507

§ 32 534—510 B.C. Tarquinius Superbus usurps the kingdom: his violent and oppressive measures . . . . p. 510
33 He institutes the Feriæ Latinæ. Death of Turnus Herdonius. Foundation of the temple of Capitoline Jupiter 511
34 Siege of Gabii: it is taken by a stratagem 513
35 The Sibylline books. Foundation of Signia and Circeii . . 514
36 Siege of Ardea. Rape of Lucretia by Sextus Tarquin. Death of Lucretia 515
37 Appearance of L. Junius Brutus. Dethronement of Tarquinius Superbus: expulsion of himself and family 517
38 Character of the accounts of the reign of Tarquinius Superbus 521
39 General results with respect to the historical evidence for the regal period 526
40 Nature of the regal government. Difficulty of reconciling the historical accounts with the accounts of the government . 531
41 Topographical history of Rome under the kings 543

AN

INQUIRY INTO THE CREDIBILITY OF THE EARLY ROMAN HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1 A NEW attempt to investigate the early history of Rome may incur the risk of being condemned as either presumptuous or superfluous. It may be thought that preceding writers have discovered the truth; or that, if they have failed to discover it, the endeavours of others are not likely to be more successful. It is indeed certain that if, on the one hand, the subject is exhausted, all additional labour bestowed upon it must be thrown away; and that if, on the other, the problem is insoluble, all efforts to solve it must be vain. Before, however, we adopt either of these definitive views, and assume either that our knowledge of early Roman history is so complete that nothing can enlarge it, or so obscure that nothing can enlighten it, an accurate survey of the position in which the subject has been left by the most recent inquiries seems imperatively required. For this purpose we will briefly trace the general progress of Roman history, from the revival of literature to the present time.

In the first two centuries after the invention of printing, the history of Rome, for the regal and republican periods, was principally studied in Livy or in the classical compendia of Florus and Eutropius, and in Plutarch's Lives. The work of Dionysius was occasionally consulted, but was never generally read. Learned and laborious men called in the assistance of the treatises on various branches of Roman antiquities which had been composed by Italian, French, Dutch, and German scholars.(1) The entire history of Rome was in general treated as entitled to implicit belief; all ancient authors were put upon the same footing, and regarded as equally credible; all parts of an author's work were, moreover, supposed to rest on the same basis. Not only was Livy's authority as high as that of Thucydides or Tacitus, but his account of the kings was considered as credible as that of the wars with Hannibal, Philip, Antiochus, or Perseus: and again the Lives of Romulus, Numa, or Coriolanus, by Plutarch, were deemed as veracious as those of Fabius Maximus, Sylla, or Cicero. Machiavel, in his 'Discourses on the first Decad of Livy,' takes this view of the early history. The seven kings of Rome are to him not less real than the twelve Cæsars; and the examples which he derives from the early period of the Republic are not less certain and authentic than if they had been selected from the civil wars of Marius and Sylla, or of Cæsar and Pompey. Antiquity and ancient writers were, at this time, studied and admired as a whole: there was little critical discrimination in appreciating the varieties in the evidences and character of the different periods of ancient history. Romulus and Augustus Cæsar; Lycurgus, Solon, and Pericles, all came under the same general category, as great men of the Greek and Roman world.

The works of universal history which were published during the seventeenth century, (such as those of Sir Walter Ralegh and Dr. William Howel,)(2) necessarily included a narrative of

---

(1) For a character of this class of writings, see Schwegler, 'Römische Geschichte' (Tübingen, 1853), vol. i. p. 133-4.

(2) Ralegh's 'History of the World,' (published in 1614) is very brief on the first five centuries of Rome. B. 2, c. 24, includes the period from the foundation of the city to the reign of Tullus Hostilius. B. 4, c. 7, the period from the reign of Tullus Hostilius to the wars of Pyrrhus. Dr. Howel's 'History of the World,' in two large closely printed folio volumes, ed. 2, 1680, is more copious upon this portion of Roman History than Ralegh. B. 1, c. 6, contains the foundation of Rome and the early period. B. 2, c. 4, relates the period from the banishment of Tarquin to the war with Privernum, 424 U.C. B. 3, c. 9, relates the period from the war with Privernum to the dominion of Augustus. On Howel's History, see Wachler, 'Geschichte der Historichen Forschung,' vol. i. p. 807.

Roman affairs; but it was not till the beginning of the eighteenth century that separate Roman histories, composed in the modern languages, began to issue from the press. One of the first of these was the Roman History of Lawrence Echard, one volume of which, containing the period from the foundation of the city to the dominion of Augustus, was published near the end of the seventeenth century.(3) It was followed, after a short interval, by the voluminous work of the Jesuits, Catrou and Rouillé (1725), in which the former contributed the text, and the latter the notes and dissertations.(4) The Roman history of Rollin, published in 1739, was in substance an abridgment of the more copious work of the Jesuits, and viewed the early ages of Rome in the same light.(5) That of Hooke, which followed soon afterwards, had likewise the same character in its first volume: in the subsequent volumes he pursued a more independent course.(6) Vertot's work on the

---

(3) 'The Roman History from the building of the City to the perfect settlement of the Empire by Augustus Cæsar. By Lawrence Echard, A.M.,' in 1 vol. 8vo. The copy in the British Museum is the eighth edition, of the date 1719. The history down to the first Punic war occupies 181 pages of vol. 1. In four additional volumes the history of the Roman empire is brought down to 1453. The fourth edition of the first vol. is stated by Chalmers to have been published in 1699. Echard says, in the preface to his Roman History: 'There never was anything of this kind in our language before, nor anything relating to the Roman affairs, but either what has been intermixed with much more other history, or what has contained but a few years of this part.' Concerning Echard's Roman History, see Wachler, ib. vol. i. p. 390. Echard was born about 1671, and died in 1730.

(4) This work, entitled 'Histoire Romaine, depuis la fondation de Rome,' occupies twenty quarto volumes. The first volume relates to the regal period; the fifth volume brings the history to the year 467 B.C., a few years before the landing of Pyrrhus. The approbation of the censeur royal is dated March, 1724. The preface alludes to its being the first complete History of Rome. The doubts respecting the early Roman history, recently started by Pouilly, are mentioned and controverted, pref. p. ix.—xxii. An English translation of this work in six folio volumes, by R. Bundy, bears the date 1728-37. A life of Catrou and an account of his Roman History is in Moreri, Dict. Hist. in v., where there is also an article on Rouillé. Catrou was born in 1659, and died in 1737.

(5) Rollin was born in 1661, and died in 1741.

(6) Hooke, in the preface to his Roman History, alludes to the compendious History of Echard, and to the extensive one of the Jesuits; also to Rollin's History: and he states that 'his project at first was nothing more than to abridge the Jesuits' voluminous compilation, making use

Revolutions of Rome was prior, in point of time, to that of the Jesuits; it was not a continuous history, but, though distinguished by greater excellences of style, it was founded on the same critical principles.(7) The works of Echard, Vertot, Catrou, Rollin, and Hooke, serve to characterize the period of uninquiring and uncritical reproduction of Roman history. Their system was to eliminate marvels and patent improbabilities; to reconcile discrepancies; to harmonize the various accounts into a coherent flowing narrative, and to treat the result as well-ascertained fact.

§ 2 Nearly at the same time, however, that a continuous narrative of Roman history, based on a faithful reproduction of the ancients, was for the first time published, there rose up a spirit of sceptical inquiry which called in question the truth of this history, as it had been related by the ancients, and as it was repeated by the moderns, for the first four or five centuries of the city. Even in the previous century, some writers, in works destined only for scholars, had questioned the historical character of the early ages of Rome. Cluverius, in particular,

---

occasionally of M. Vertot's sprightly narrative of the revolutions in the Roman government. That project, however, he did not closely and constantly follow, even in this first volume, and he wholly departed from it in composing the second.' Nathaniel Hooke was a Roman Catholic: his History is dedicated to Pope. The year of his birth is unknown, he died in 1764.

(7) The following character of this work is given by M. de Barante. 'Il ne faisait point de recherches nouvelles sur l'histoire de Rome. Il ne s'efforcait point, comme on fait maintenant, de decouvrir à travers la couleur épique dont la poésie, les traditions, les historiens eux-mêmes ont revêtu les annales de la maîtresse du monde, quelles furent ses véritables origines, son état social, son gouvernement et ses lois aux diverses époques. Il prit pour véritable cette Rome telle que nos études classiques l'ont créée dans notre imagination. De plus grands esprits que l'Abbé de Vertot l'ont bien aussi adoptée pour base de leurs vues politiques. D'ailleurs, il aimait à raconter et à peindre; l'histoire lui apparaissait sous son aspect dramatique. Il écrivit les révolutions de Rome comme Corneille composait ses tragédies, et il prenait la chose si fort à cœur, qu'on le voyait fondre en larmes à l'académie, en lisant le discours de Véturie à Coriolan. Ainsi c'est surtout le talent du récit qu'il faut chercher dans son livre. Encore ne doit on pas espérer de retrouver la couleur du temps et des lieux. Les sentiments, les mœurs, les relations sociales, tout prend un aspect moderne, ainsi que dans une tragédie du Théâtre Français.' Biog. Univ. in v. Vertot was born in 1655, and died in 1735. His 'Révolutions Romaines' first appeared in 1719.

in his learned work on 'Ancient Italy,' published in 1624, had rejected not only the history of the Trojan settlement in Latium, and the Alban dynasty, but the account of the founders and foundation of Rome; he likewise expressed an opinion that the history of the entire period before the Gallic capture of the city was uncertain.(8) Bochart had regarded the legend of Æneas as unhistorical;(9) and Perizonius, in his 'Animadversiones Historicæ,' published in 1685, called attention to the defectiveness of the external evidences for the early centuries of Rome.(10) The subject was however now treated with greater boldness, and in writings addressed to a wider circle of readers. The first who formally opened the discussion was M. de Pouilly, who, in an Essay read to the French Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres, in December, 1722, undertook to demonstrate the uncertainty of the Roman history, until the war with Pyrrhus. He laid down with clearness and accuracy the principles by which the question is to be decided, but did not pursue them into their detailed application.(11) His conclusions were controverted, in the

---

(8) See his Italia Antiqua, lib. iii. c. 2, particularly p. 821, 826, 829, 832, 835. In p. 829 he quotes the passage of Livy, vi. 1, and adds 'Parum igitur vel nihil certi de iis quæ ante captam incensamque urbem gesta fuerunt, scribere potuerunt Romani auctores.' In a subsequent page he is still more explicit: 'Verum enimvero Latinorum sive Romanorum regibus, qui ab Evandro ad consules usque fuere, falsas ascriptas esse origines, falsa item nomina, falsasque interdum res gestas, nihil sit mirum; quando, ut supra ostensum, monimenta antiquissimorum illorum temporum posteriores Romani habuerunt nulla; Græci autem, a quibus postea suas mutuati sunt historias Romani, pro libitu suo, quæcumque vel per quietem somniassent, falsa pro veris, non minus audacter quam impudenter prodiderint.'—p. 855. Philip Cluwer, a native of Danzic, was born in 1580, and died in 1623.

(9) Epistola de quæstione, num Æneas unquam fuerit in Italiâ: op. vol. 1, p. 1063. See Schwegler, ib. p. 280.

(10) See c. 4 and 5, Schwegler, ib. p. 135.

(11) See his Dissertation sur l'incertitude de l'histoire des quatre premiers siècles de Rome, in the Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, tom. vi. p. 14-29, and his second memoir, ib. p. 71. M. de Pouilly thus distinguishes between history and oral tradition: 'L'histoire est la relation d'un fait que nous tenons de ceux que nous savons en avoir été les témoins: il resulte de cette définition, qu'afin qu'une histoire soit authentique, il faut que son auteur, ou du moins celui sur les mémoires duquel l'on sait qu'elle a été faite, ait vécu dans le temps où se sont passés les événements qu'il rapporte; qu'il ait été à portée d'en être instruit; et que sa fidelité ni son exactitude ne soient point suspectes.'—p. 74.

'La tradition est un bruit populaire dont on ne connoit point la source;

'Memoirs of the Academy,' by his colleague, the Abbé Sallier;(12) but his cause soon obtained a powerful ally in the person of M. Louis de Beaufort, a French Protestant refugee, whose celebrated 'Dissertation sur l'incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l'histoire romaine,' appeared at Utrecht, in 1738.(13) In this work, an attempt was made, by an examination of the general character of the evidence, and a critical analysis of certain portions of the history, to prove that the received accounts are unworthy of credit. The results at which he arrives in this Dissertation are sceptical and negative. His general conclusion is, that not only the history of the regal period, and of the republican period before the capture of Rome by the Gauls, but also of the subsequent republican period from the capture of the city to the close of the fifth century, is uncertain, and full of false or doubtful facts. But although he considers the history of the first five centuries uncertain, he nevertheless thinks that the narrative

---

c'est la relation d'un fait, qui s'est transmise jusqu'à nous par une suite d'hommes, dont les premiers se dérobent à notre connaissance; c'est une chaîne dont nous tenons un bout, l'autre se perd dans les abîmes du passé. L'on voit par ces définitions la différence essentielle qu'il y a entre l'histoire et la tradition: nous pouvons juger d'une relation historique par le caractère de son auteur; nous ne pouvons juger d'une tradition que par son ancienneté, par son étendue, et par la nature du fait qu'elle renferme.'—p. 80-1. He holds that everything in Roman History is oral tradition down to the capture of the City by the Gauls, ib. 107. There is no life of M. de Pouilly in the Biographie Universelle.

(12) The Abbé Sallier's three Memoirs, in answer to M. de Pouilly, may be seen, ib. p. 30, 52, 115. Sallier was born in 1685, and died in 1761. M. de Pouilly's conclusions are also disputed (as has been previously stated) in the preface to the History of Catrou and Rouillé.

(13) A second edition of this work, revised, corrected, and considerably augmented, was published at the Hague in 1750. My references are however to the first edition; I have been unable to obtain access to a copy of the second edition. See 'Notes and Queries,' vol. x. p. 101. The first edition has only the writer's initials (L.D.B.) on the title-page; the authorship is however recognised in the preliminary discourse to the *République Romaine*. The accounts of M. de Beaufort in the French Biographical Dictionaries are very meagre. Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1, p. cxxvii., says that he was a refugee, who had lived for a long time in England. In the title-page to his *République Romaine*, he calls himself a member of the Royal Society of London. Late in his life, he became the preceptor of the Prince of Hesse Homburg—that is probably of Frederic Landgrave of Hesse Homburg, who was born in 1769. The princes of this house are Protestants. He is stated to have died at Maestricht, in 1795.

rests on a substratum of truth: although he holds a large portion of the details to be fictitious or ill attested, he believes that they contain a nucleus of real fact. In his dissertation he confines himself to proofs of the uncertainty of the early history; but in his subsequent and more voluminous work, entitled 'The Roman Republic,'(14) he enters upon the positive part of the question. In the preliminary discourse of this work, he lays down certain rules for distinguishing the certain from the uncertain in the early Roman history: and he exemplifies these rules by a sketch of the history of the earliest period, as he thinks it ought to be written. The principles upon which he proceeds are, to reject most of the details, and to attempt the formation of a historical chain, in which the successive links shall be consistent with each other, and in which the subsequent events shall, as far as possible, imply those that precede.(15) Thus he thinks that the Romans had in reality a king named Romulus, to whom they perhaps owed some laws and some customs; but he holds it to be quite uncertain whether Romulus was the founder, or only the restorer of Rome; as he believes that Rome was in existence long before the time assigned for the reign of Romulus; indeed he treats the time of Romulus as altogether uncertain, and he regards it as a matter of indifference whether it be placed a century sooner or later. 'It is impossible (he says) to lay down, in precise terms, with any approach to certainty, the form of government which Romulus established, the laws which he gave to the Romans, the conquests which he made, the extent of the Roman territory under his reign, the duration of his reign, and indeed the age in which he lived.'(16) He considers the number of the Roman kings, the length of each reign, and the total duration of the regal period equally uncertain. He does not deny the existence of Numa, or of his two successors but he places no reliance upon any of the details respecting their acts. 'The three last reigns (he says), as being nearer to the revolution, exhibit some traces of the position in which the Romans stood, when they shook off the yoke of the royal dominion. If we reject a few fables, and if we disregard all statements as to dates, and duration of reigns, which cannot be fixed on any trustworthy authority, we shall find various events, of which the proof occurs in the sequel of the history, and which are necessarily connected with the subsequent events.'(17) In accordance with this view, he gives a sketch of the reigns of the two Tarquins and Servius, in which he treats as authentic the numbers of the census under Servius, reported by Dionysius and Livy;(18) as well as that in the second consulship of Publicola;(19) he likewise regards the constitution of centuries as the work of Servius, and as proving that his real policy was aristocratic and not democratic.(20) He proceeds to describe in general terms the revolution which expelled the Tarquins and established the consular form of government, as well as the war with Porsena, and the other wars of the early period of the Republic. In commenting on the discrepancies between Livy and Dionysius as to the Sabine war of 505 B.C., he remarks that little reliance can be placed upon such historians, and that for this reason he limits himself, not to that which is simply probable, but to that which is connected with the course of the history, and which represents to us the state of the Romans at that time as it ought to have been, in order that they should have become what we see them to have been in the subsequent times.(21)

---

(14) 'La République Romaine, ou plan général de l'ancien gouvernement de Rome.' Paris, 1767. 6 vols. 12mo.

(15) Règles que l'auteur se propose de suivre pour distinguer le certain d'avec l'incertain.—Disc. Prel. §. 2, tom. i. p. 11.

(16) Ib. p. 25.

The detailed accounts of the early wars are likewise, he thinks, unworthy of belief; because the ancient historians often put a whole for a part, and represent the Romans as fighting with an entire nation, when only a single canton of it had taken up arms; because they multiply the victories; because they exaggerate the number of the slain; because they represent battles of uncertain event to have been Roman victories; and because they always represent the enemies of the Romans as the aggressors. Almost all the wars of Rome were (he says) doubtless successful, inasmuch as she ended by subjugating all the nations of Italy; but there is no certainty in the accounts of the historians, who in their details sin not only against truth, but even against probability.(22)

---

(17) Disc. Prel. § 2, tom. i. p. 29.
(18) Ib. p. 31.—See Dion. Hal. iv. 22; Livy i. 44.
(19) Dion. Hal. v. 20.
(20) Ib. p. 40-1.
(21) Ib. p. 70.

The ancient historians have, however, he thinks, transmitted to us a more faithful account of the internal state of Rome, and he considers it easy, with some attention, to form a correct idea of the primitive government, and to follow the changes which it underwent. He illustrates this remark by a sketch of the constitutional history in the first years of the Republic. He thinks that the relations of the Senate and the People at this period have been misunderstood by Dionysius and Livy, who conceived the tribunes of the third and fourth centuries as similar to the tribunes of the time of the civil wars: and he regards the account of the conduct of the popular party as the truest portion of the Roman history, which it will be easy to restore to its real light.(23)

§ 3 The conclusions of Beaufort were controverted by Hooke, in a 'Dissertation on the Credibility of the first 500 years of Rome,' prefixed to the second volume of the quarto edition of his history; but although the inquiries of Beaufort influenced some of the subsequent writers on the subject (for instance, Ferguson, in his 'History of the Roman Republic'),(24) the question made but little progress, and received but little new light,(25) until the publication of Niebuhr's History, in 1811-12; afterwards reprinted, with large alterations and additions, in 1827-32. This work constitutes a great epoch in the modern treatment of Roman history. The enlarged edition, published by the author himself, brings the history down only to the execution of Manlius, in 384 B.C. A third posthumous volume, partly founded on a revised portion of the first edition of the second volume, and partly on unpublished papers, completes the First Punic War, and therefore includes the entire period which we shall have occasion to examine.(26)

---

(22) Ib. p. 5.

(23) Ib. p. 108.—The same sketch is afterwards continued in the 'Considérations sur les différends du sénat et du peuple.'—Tom. vi. p. 263-390. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 1216, remarks that Beaufort's purpose was merely negative; and Lect. vol. i. p. 87, that his Dissertation 'displays that spirit of scepticism which only destroys without reconstructing.' This remark applies only to the Dissertation, and not to the subsequent 'République Romaine,' where Beaufort sets forth his reconstructive views in detail. Niebuhr likewise remarks of Hooke, that 'he wrote in a good spirit and with judgment, but never conceived the notion that it was possible to reduce the chaos of Roman history to order.'—Hist. vol. ii. p. 204. In vol. iii. p. 159, Niebuhr speaks of his own laborious researches, 'by which he has brought into order the chaos of the early times of Rome.'

Niebuhr pursued in the main a course similar to that which had been followed by Beaufort, as well in the negative as in the positive treatment of the subject. His learning was more extensive, his knowledge of antiquity and of medieval history was more comprehensive, his imagination more active, and his memory more capacious, than those of his predecessor; moreover, he undertook to compose a connected history, whereas Beaufort, after his critical dissertation, composed only a description of the political antiquities of Rome, and gave only a brief outline of the events. He likewise shows what part of it is to be believed, and in what sense the traditionary accounts are to be understood. But he carries both his scepticism and his reconstruction further than Beaufort. He exhibits greater boldness both in rejecting and in restoring. In fact, he has to a great extent cast aside the received narrative of Roman history down to the capture of the city by the Gauls, and has substituted another in its place. He has demolished the existing fabric, and out of its ruins he has built a new history, in a form not only different from that in which it has been related by modern writers, but from that in which it had been conceived by Cicero, Dionysius, and Livy.(27)

---

(24) Published in 1783, in 3 vols. 4to. Adam Ferguson was born in 1724, and died in 1816.

(25) A Memoir by P. C. Levesque, entitled, 'Doutes, conjectures et discussions sur différens points de l'histoire romaine,' which was read to the Institute in the eleventh year of the Republic, called in question the credibility of the early Roman history. Mém. de l'Institut, classe d'histoire, 1815.—Tom. ii. It was answered by Larcher, 'Observations sur l'authenticité de l'origine de Rome,' 15 June, 1804, ib. See also Levesque, 'Histoire critique de la République romaine,' 3 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1807; where his sceptical view of the early history is repeated, but with little learning or ability.

(26) B. G. Niebuhr, born August, 1776, died January, 1831. All the references in the following pages are to the third edition of the translation of the first 2 vols. of the history, by Archdeacon Hare and Bishop Thirlwall, London, 1837-8; and to the translation of the 3rd vol., by Dr. Smith and Dr. Schmitz, London, 1842; whenever Niebuhr's Lectures are cited, the reference is to Dr. Schmitz's translation of his Lectures on the History of Rome, ed. 2, 3 vols. London, 1850-1849.

Niebuhr has fully recognised the absence of contemporary historians prior to the war with Pyrrhus, and has admitted the important results which it involves. He frequently adverts to the imperfections of the external attestation for the early period. The main characteristic of his history, however, is the extent to which he relies upon internal evidence, and upon the indications afforded by the narrative itself, independently of the testimony to its truth. Thus he considers the reigns of Romulus and Numa as purely fabulous and poetical, and the period from Tullus Hostilius to the first secession of the plebs as mythico-historical—as compounded of truth and fiction; while he thinks that a veracious and solid history may, by a proper process of reconstruction, be recovered for the period from the first secession down to the commencement of contemporary registration. This division of periods is exclusively founded on esoteric grounds: it is unsupported by any difference in the external testimony.

---

(27) Dr. Arnold, Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 218-21, justly remarks that Niebuhr's work is not so much characterized by his rejection of the early Roman history, as by his attempts to restore and establish it. 'Niebuhr' (he says) 'maintains that a true history of Rome, with many details of dates, places, events, and characters, may be recovered from the beginning of the commonwealth. It has been greatly corrupted and disguised by ignorant and uncritical writers; but there exist, he thinks, sufficient materials to enable us, not only to get rid of these corruptions, but to restore that genuine and original edifice, which they have so long overgrown and hidden from our view.' 'Were I indeed' (he adds) to venture to criticize the work of this great man, I should be inclined to charge him with having overvalued rather than undervalued the possible certainty of the early history of the Roman commonwealth.'—Schwegler, ib. p. 146, likewise contrasts the merely critical and sceptical results of Beaufort with the reconstructive procedure of Niebuhr. 'Niebuhr's work (he remarks) is the positive complement of the negative investigations of his predecessors.'—Rein, 'Römisches Privatrecht,' (Leipzig, 1836,) says that Niebuhr stands alone, in having effectually overthrown the formerly received history; and in having formed a new fabric, by able combinations, a fabric which cannot be shaken, although particular defects in it may be attacked.—p. 14.

§ 4 The work of Niebuhr has formed a great landmark in the recent treatment of early Roman history. Almost all the subsequent works on the subject are either founded upon his researches, or are occupied to a great extent with criticisms of his conclusions, and with reasons for rejecting or doubting them. Among the former of these the work of Dr. Arnold stands conspicuous; which had been brought down to the end of the First Punic War, before he was unhappily carried off by a premature death.(28) Among the latter, it will be sufficient to name the work of Becker, on 'Roman Antiquities,' continued since his death by Marquardt; and the history of Schwegler, one volume of which, comprising the regal period, has alone appeared.(29) In these and other works, many of Niebuhr's opinions on questions of Roman history are disputed or doubted; and, it may be said, that there is scarcely any of the leading conclusions of Niebuhr's work which has not been impugned by some subsequent writer. Even his views upon the Agrarian laws—the soundest and most valuable portion of his history—have not escaped contradiction in certain points. Furthermore, a recent History of Rome, published at Basle, by Gerlach and Bachofen, and written with considerable erudition, not only repudiates the reconstructive part of Niebuhr's work, but even refuses assent to his negative criticisms, and returns to the old implicit faith in the early period, such as it was in the time of Echard, Catrou, and Rollin.(30) The history of Niebuhr has thus opened more questions than it has closed, and it has set in motion a large body of combatants, whose mutual variances are not at present likely to be settled by deference to a common authority, or by the recognition of any common principle.

---

(28) The first two volumes bear date 1838 and 1840. A third and posthumous volume, in which the history is brought down to 206 B.C., appeared in 1843, under the editorship of Archdeacon Hare. Concerning Dr. Arnold's relations to Niebuhr, see vol. i., pref. p. ix., ib. p. 220, 372.

(29) See Schwegler's character of Niebuhr's history, ib. p. 144-50. He says that among all the writers on Roman history, Niebuhr was the first who formed an accurate and complete idea of the ancient constitution, who rightly conceived the origin, connexion, and mutual influence of the Roman institutions; and that, however much he may have left to his successors to amend and to complete, in the main historical questions he almost always took the correct view. He considers Niebuhr's chief defect to be a want of impartial and sound exegesis of ancient authors.

The main cause of the great multiplicity and wide divergence of opinions, which characterize the recent researches into early Roman history, is the defective method, which not only Niebuhr and his followers, but most of his opponents, have adopted. Instead of employing those tests of credibility which are consistently applied to modern history, they attempt to guide their judgment by the indications of internal evidence, and assume that the truth can be discovered by an occult faculty of historical divination. Hence, the task which they have undertaken resembles an inquiry into the internal structure of the earth, or into the question, whether the stars are inhabited. It is an attempt to solve a problem, for the solution of which no sufficient data exist.

The consequence is, that ingenuity and labour can produce nothing but hypotheses and conjectures, which may be supported by analogies, and may sometimes appear specious and attractive, but can never rest on the solid foundation of proof. There will, therefore, be a series of such conjectural histories; each successive writer will reject all or some of the guesses of his predecessors, and will propose some new hypotheses of his own.(31) But the treatment of early Roman history, though it will be constantly moving, will not advance; it will not be stationary, but neither will it be progressive; it will be unfixed and changeable, but without receiving any improvement; and it will perpetually revolve in the same hopeless circle. Like the search after the philosopher's stone, or the elixir of life, it will be constantly varying its aspect, under the treatment of different professors of the futile science; but truth and certainty, the aim of all rational employment of the intellect, will always be equally distant. Each new system of the early Roman constitution will be only (to use Paley's words) one guess among many; whereas, he alone discovers who proves. There is indeed no doubt that long habit, combined with a happy talent, may enable a person to discern the truth where it is invisible to ordinary minds, possessing no peculiar advantages.(32) This may be observed, not only in historical researches, but in every other department of knowledge. In order, however, that the truth so perceived should recommend itself to the convictions of others, it is a necessary condition that it should admit of proof which they can understand. Newton might have perceived, by a rapid and intuitive sagacity, the connexion between the fall of an apple and the attraction of the earth to the sun; but unless he could have demonstrated that connexion by arguments which were intelligible and satisfactory to the scientific world, his discovery would have been useless, except as a mere suggestion. In like manner, we may rejoice that the ingenuity and learning of Niebuhr should have enabled him to advance many novel hypotheses and conjectures respecting events in the early history, and respecting the form of the early constitution, of Rome.(33) But unless he can support those hypotheses by suf-

---

(30) Die Geschichte der Römer, von F. D. Gerlach und J. J. Bachofen. 1 vol., in two parts. Basil: 1851. It completes the period of the kings. In seeking to establish the historical character of the settlement of Æneas in Latium, and of the Italian wars celebrated in the Æneid, the authors deplore 'the pernicious tendency of the researches into Roman history since the time of Niebuhr.'—I. i. p. 180.

(31) Compare the judicious remarks of Moser upon the various hypothetical emendations of the passage of Cicero de Rep. ii. 22, concerning the centuries of Servius: 'Ego vero cum viderim, quam facili negotio posterior semper prioris interpretis sententiam infregerit, vel certe se infregisse censuerit, nolui equidem novam, quam jam excogitaveram, in medium proferre rationem, non meliorem illam tribus, quas ultimo loco exposui, rationibus; satis persuasus exstiturum mox, qui probet, neque meam neque sex priorum veram esse sententiam, sed suam, eamque octavam. Quâ de re cum adiissem virum in his rebus probe versatum,

---

ille me, cum ejus sententiam exquirerem, quod ego ipse constitueram, ampliandum esse monuit, donec vel reliquæ horum librorum partes vel Livii libri inter primam et tertiam decadem deperditi, vel alia rei expediendæ adjumenta reperiantur.'—Exc. ad Cic. de Rep. p. 535.

(32) See Niebuhr's remarks, Hist. vol. iii. p. 321, and compare vol. i. p. 176.

(33) These are what he calls his *discoveries*. Thus in the preface to the second volume of his history, he describes his continuous study, for sixteen months, of the early history of the commonwealth, and he

ficient evidence, they are not entitled to our belief. It is not enough for a historian to claim the possession of a retrospective second-sight, which is denied to the rest of the world; of a mysterious doctrine, revealed only to the initiated. Unless he can prove as well as guess; unless he can produce evidence of the fact, after he has intuitively perceived its existence, his historical system cannot be received. The oases of truth which he discerns amidst the trackless expanses of fiction and legend, may be real; but until their existence can be verified by positive testimony, we have no certainty that these 'green spots in memory's waste,' may not be mere mirage and optical delusion. It is an excellence in a historian of antiquity, who has sufficient data to proceed upon, that he should form a vivid conception of the events described; that he should live, as it were, among the persons whose acts he recounts; and that he should carry his reader back into the bygone times in which his drama is placed. On the other hand, it is a fault in the modern writers who first narrated Roman history that they should have related the events as if they had never happened.(34) But when there is a want of solid evidence, we do not render the history true, by treating the events as if they were real.

§ 5 It is therefore proposed, in the following pages, to make a systematic examination of the external evidences of the early Roman history, and to inquire how far the received accounts are supported by the testimony of credible witnesses. It seems to be often believed, and at all events it is perpetually assumed

---

proceeds thus: 'My sight grew dim in its passionate efforts to pierce into the obscurity of the subject; and unless I was to send forth an incomplete work, which sooner or later would have had to be wholly remodelled, I was compelled to wait for what time might gradually bring forth. Nor has he been niggardly, but, though slowly, has granted me one discovery after another.'—p. vi. In vol. iii. p. 318, he treats his own historical divination as equivalent to the Greek *μαντεία*.

(34) Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. 87, remarks, that in Rollin's time, Roman history was written as if its events had in reality never taken place. In Hist. vol. iii. p. 159, he states that his object is to clear up the history of Rome (so far as his powers and the existing resources allow) in such a manner that it may become no less familiar and perceptible than that of modern times, in which we have not lived ourselves. Compare ib. p. 338.

in practice, that historical evidence is different in its nature from other sorts of evidence. Until this error is effectually extirpated, all historical researches must lead to uncertain results. Historical evidence, like judicial evidence, is founded on the testimony of credible witnesses. Unless these witnesses had personal and immediate perception of the facts which they report, unless they saw and heard what they undertake to relate as having happened, their evidence is not entitled to credit. As all original witnesses must be contemporary with the events which they attest, it is a necessary condition for the credibility of a witness that he be a contemporary; though a contemporary is not necessarily a credible witness. Unless therefore a historical account can be traced, by probable proof, to the testimony of contemporaries, the first condition of historical credibility fails.(35)

The notion that the rules of historical evidence are of so pliable a nature as to accommodate themselves to circumstances, has caused a greater laxity to exist with respect to the history of antiquity; inasmuch as its evidence is often imperfect, and derived from traditionary and hearsay sources. This laxity seems to be justified by the doctrine of taking the best evidence which can be obtained; where however that evidence is wholly uncertain, we must be careful not to treat it as certain, because none other can be procured. But whatever may be its origin, a habit of applying different rules of evidence to ancient and modern history, and of having a lax code for the former, and a strict code for the latter, has unquestionably grown up. In sifting the evidence for a modern fact, we proceed with some approach to judicial strictness; we identify and enumerate the witnesses, we examine their true character, motives, position, and means of information, and we hence estimate their credibility. We scrutinize their respective depositions, leaving as little as possible to conjecture and surmise; and upon the balance of testimonies, so sifted and weighed, we decide the result. But as soon as we enter the region of antiquity, and especially when we ascend to its earlier periods, we discard all these safeguards for historical truth, and we admit the smallest fragment of evidence, anonymous, hearsay, traditionary, written down centuries after the occurrence of the events, by strangers in time and even in nation; testimonies uncertified and unauthenticated, not fulfilling any of the fundamental conditions of credibility; as sufficient to establish the most important facts.

---

(35) 'Il n'y a pas beaucoup plus de différence entre la fausse monnoie et la bonne qu'entre un témoin qui a ouï dire et un témoin qui a vu.' Bayle, Dict. Drusius. Note Q.—With this passage, the following verse of Plautus corresponds:—

'Pluris est oculatus testis unus quam auriti decem.'
Trucul. act. ii. sc. 6, v. 8.

An *auritus testis* in this verse is not an ear-witness, but a person who repeats a story which he has heard, whose evidence is hearsay. Respecting the difference between original and hearsay evidence, and the causes of the inferiority of the latter, see the author's 'Treatise on the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics,' c. 7, § 3-12, and 19.

The object of the following inquiry will be to apply to the early Roman history the same rules of evidence which are applied, by common consent, to modern history, and to try it by the tests by which the reality of modern facts is determined. With this view, we shall first endeavour to ascertain the general character of the sources from which the extant narrative of the early centuries of Rome has been derived, and to discover how it came to assume the form in which it has been delivered to modern times. When this part of our task has been accomplished, it will be necessary to proceed one step further, and to examine the extant narrative, in order to try how far its internal character and composition, and its external attestation, agree. It has been truly remarked that a critical inquiry into the credibility of the early Roman history can scarcely be separated from a positive exposition of the facts out of which that history is formed.(36) A detailed examination of the narrative of the early history, such as we have received it, with a constant reference to the principles above set forth, will at least tend to bring the question to a clear and intelligible issue, and to remove the uncertainty in which the student of this period finds himself enveloped, amidst conflicting opinions advanced on opposite sides with equal confidence. Even if he should be led at last to the conclusion that historical certainty, for the period in question, is unattainable, he will at least have the satisfaction of avoiding a fruitless search after a non-existent object, and an attempt to discover a treasure which time has already destroyed.

---

(36) See Schwegler, ib. p. 141.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE SOURCES OF ROMAN HISTORY DURING THE LAST TWO CENTURIES OF THE REPUBLIC.

§ 1 IT has been already remarked, that the credibility of the early Roman history, as of every other history, depends upon its being traceable to the testimony of contemporary witnesses. If it can be shown that the accounts of the early period of Rome, which have come down to us, were derived, directly or indirectly, from the reports of original witnesses, coeval with the events described, it may be considered as presumptively entitled to credit. If no proof to this effect can be given, it must be considered as insufficiently authenticated, and therefore unworthy of belief.

In order to assist our judgment in applying this criterion to the early Roman annals, it will be convenient to start from a period whose history is clearly founded upon contemporary evidence, and to recede until we find that the contemporary historians have deserted us.

The termination of the republican period of Rome may be placed at the death of Pompey, in the 706th year of the city and the 48th year before the Christian era.(1) If we take our departure from this point, and ascend the stream of Roman history, we shall find that we are accompanied by native contemporary authors, in the strictest sense of the word, for 177 years, up to the commencement of the Gallic War, in the 529th year of the city, or 225 B.C.; that, with an allowable latitude of construction, this period may be extended to 216 years, up to the commencement of the First Punic War, in the 490th year of the city, or 264 B.C.; and that, if we call in the assistance of the contemporary Greek writers, we may mount as far back as 233 years, to the 473rd year of the city, or 281 B.C., when Pyrrhus landed in Italy, and the Romans came for the first time into conflict with an array of Greeks.(2)

---

(1) As the change from the republican to the imperial government of Rome was not avowed, there is no fixed period for the commencement of the Roman empire. Dio Cassius speaks of the exploits of the Romans during 725 years (until 29 B.C.), first under the kings, afterwards under the democracy, and lastly under the δυναστεῖαι, or the despotic rule of various persons from Sylla downwards, lii. 1. He likewise reckons the monarchical rule of Augustus as dating from the battle of Actium, (31 B.C.), lvi. 30. Concerning the period of the δυνασταί, see Cic. Phil. ii. 42, v. 6, xi. 1, xiii. 1, xiv. 8. Mr. Merivale considers the Republic to have been overthrown at the battle of Philippi, 42 B.C. 'Fall of the Roman Republic,' p. 496.

The period comprehended within the lives of Cicero and Julius Cæsar was not only commemorated by many professed historians, of inferior note, who lived at the time, but was illustrated by the writings of these two great men, who were themselves actors in the scenes which they described. Cæsar was born in the year 100 B.C. The birth of Cicero, as well as of Pompey, fell six years earlier. The memoirs of the Gallic war and of the Civil war by Cæsar himself, and the subsidiary memoirs of the Alexandrine, African, and Spanish wars, cover the eventful period from 58 to 46 B.C. with an authentic narrative, to which no other objection can be made than that it is the deposition of a witness, who, though well informed, is often interested.(3) The writings of Cæsar form the most ancient historical work in the Latin language, which has descended to modern times.(4) Cicero, though not a professed historian, has, in his numerous orations, written, corrected, and published by himself, and in his long series of private letters, left invaluable materials for the history of his own age. He composed, however, two accounts of his consulship, one in Greek and the other in Latin; and a poem on the same subject. He likewise wrote a second poem, *de temporibus suis*.(5) Many contemporary writers are known to us, as having made various contributions to the history of this time; such as Oppius, Cornelius Balbus, Hirtius, and others, whose names have been collected by modern scholars.(6) Numerous orations delivered at this period, had also been published by their authors;(7) some had been preserved by reporters, and the art of short-hand writing had even been introduced.(8) The laws, decrees of the Senate, and other

---

(2) In the following work, the Roman chronology of Fischer (Römische Zeittafeln. Altona: 1846, 1 vol. 4to.) has always been followed, unless it is otherwise expressed. In these tables, the Varronian era for the foundation of the city, Olymp. vi. 3, 753 B.C., is adopted.

(3) Cicero remarks of Cæsar's *Commentaries* or Memoirs, that they were intended as materials for history, but were composed in a style of such elegant and perspicuous brevity, that no sane man would attempt either to overlay them with ornament, or to supersede them. 'Atque etiam commentarios quosdam scripsit rerum suarum. Valde quidem, inquam, probandos; nudi enim sunt, recti, et venusti, omni ornatu orationis, tanquam veste, detracto. Sed dum voluit alios habere parata unde sumerent qui vellent scribere historiam, ineptis gratum fortasse fecit, qui volent illa calamistris inurere; sanos quidem homines a scribendo deterruit. Nihil est enim in historiâ purâ et illustri brevitate dulcius.'—Brut. 75. A similar observation is made by Hirtius, in his preface to the 8th book of the Gallic war, to which are subjoined some interesting facts respecting his mode of composition, 'Constat inter omnes, nihil tam operose ab aliis esse perfectum, quod non horum elegantiâ commentariorum

---

superetur; qui sunt editi ne scientia tantarum rerum scriptoribus deesset, adeoque probantur omnium judicio, ut prærepta, non præbita, facultas scriptoribus videatur. Cujus tamen rei major nostra, quam reliquorum, est admiratio: ceteri enim, quam bene atque emendate; nos etiam quam facile atque celeriter eos perfecerit scimus. Erat autem in Cæsare quum facultas atque elegantia summa scribendi, tum verissima scientia suorum consiliorum explicandorum.' Compare Suet. Cæsar, c. 56. Drumann, Geschichte Roms, vol. iii. p. 754—8, where the objection to Cæsar's veracity on the ground of interest is examined.—Ulrici, Antike Historiographie, p. 117. Niebuhr, Lectures, vol. iii. p. 40. The division of the Commentaries into books, was made by Cæsar himself, B. G. viii. 4. He assigned a book to each year, and therefore made an annalistic division. Compare the words of Hirtius, ib. 48. Scio Cæsarem singulorum annorum singulos commentarios confecisse.

(4) The poem of Lucretius, the language of which seems to us so antique in comparison with that of Virgil and Horace, was published only a few years before Cæsar's Commentaries of the Gallic war.

(5) Epist. ad Att. i. 19. Plut. Cæs. 8. Dio. Cass. xlvi. 21. Epist. ad Div. i. 9. The life of Cicero was likewise written by his friend, Cornelius Nepos, and his freedman Tiro.

(6) See Krause de Suetonii Fontibus (Berlin, 1831), c. 1, on Cæsar. Brückner, Leben des Cicero, vol. i. Introduction. Heeren De Fontibus vit. parall. Plutarchi, on the Lives of Pompey, Cato Minor, Brutus, Antony, Cicero, and Cæsar, p. 162—88. A history of the campaigns of Pompey was written by Theophanes of Mytilene, his friend and companion, from personal knowledge and authentic documents; but in a partial spirit. See Heeren, De Font. vit. Plut. p. 164. Drumann, Gesch. Roms, vol. iv. p. 551. Smith's Biogr. Dict. in v.

(7) See Meyer, Orat. Rom. Fragmenta, p. 317—544. Ulrici, ubi sup., p. 115.

(8) See Cicero pro Sullâ, c. 14. Plut. Cat. Min. c. 23. Merivale's 'History of Rome under the Emperors,' vol. i. p. 543.

public acts and documents were likewise extant in an authentic series, and accurate records of the annual magistrates were preserved: and when we add that the work of Livy, reaching from the foundation of the city to the death of Drusus, 9 B.C. was peculiarly copious in the later books, and that he was himself born in 59 B.C., we shall see that the ancient student of this portion of history had probably as large an amount of authentic information at his command as was extant with regard to any other period of antiquity.

Sallust, the earliest Roman writer whose compositions were considered by posterity as fulfilling the conditions of a finished historical style,(9) was contemporary with the events which he narrated, in his histories and in his Catilinarian war. His own life reached from 86 to 34 B.C.; his histories referred to the years 78—67 B.C.(10) The Catilinarian war was in 65 to 62 B.C. The war of Jugurtha, of which his account is extant, was prior to his birth, as it fell in the years 111 to 106 B.C., but the events were within the memory of the preceding generation, and could therefore be easily collected by him from contemporary informants.(11)

§ 2 For the times of Marius and Sylla, 119—78 B.C., the contemporary sources flow in a less copious stream; but the history is not the less founded on the solid basis of coeval testimony. Sylla wrote a history of his own life and times, in Latin, divided into twenty-two books, and therefore of considerable extent. It is often cited by Plutarch, as well in his life of Sylla, as in those of Marius, Sertorius, and Lucullus, under the title of Ὑπομνήματα, or Memoirs. The Latin writers cite it as *Res gestæ* or *Res suæ*. The last book was left imperfect at his death, and was completed by his freedman, Epicadus.(12) In this work, Sylla described the great battle of Marius and Catulus at Vercellæ against the Cimbri, in 101 B.C., at which he was himself present.(13) The narrative was continued till near the time of his death in 78 B.C.: and as he was born in 138 B.C., and his public life began in 107 B.C., his memoirs probably extended from 107 to 78 B.C.(14)

---

(9) Compare Sallust's remarks on his predecessors, Cat. c. 8.

'Crispus Romanâ primus in historiâ.'
Martial, xiv. 191.

C. Sallustius, rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor, Tac. Ann. iii. 30. The word 'florentissimus,' in this passage, means 'most distinguished,' 'most illustrious.' Concerning Sallust, see Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. xlvii. vol. ii. p. 315, 393, 399; vol. iii. p. 12. In the last passage, Niebuhr remarks, that 'at the time of Catiline's conspiracy, Sallust was a young man, and perfectly able to make correct observations of what was going on.' Ulrici, ubi sup., p. 125—9.

(10) See Kritze, Sallust. Hist. Fragm. p. 18.

(11) It is seldom that we can check the accuracy of the ancient historians, by comparing their reports of documents with the originals. The letter of Lentulus to Catiline, cited by Cicero, Cat. iii. 5, in the words of the original, may, however be compared with the improved and embellished version in Sallust, Cat. 44. The substance is nevertheless unaltered. The speech of Memmius in Jugurth. 31, is (as Egger remarks, 'Examen des Historiens d'Auguste,' p. 349) evidently the composition of the historian, though he leads the reader to expect a faithful report of the orator's words. It is doubtless founded on authentic speeches of Memmius, which were then extant.

Q. Lutatius Catulus wrote a historical account of his own consulship and actions, which is commended by Cicero for its easy and Xenophontean style.(15) The consulship of Catulus falls in 102 B.C., and his chief exploit was the battle of Vercellæ. Plutarch had not read this work of Catulus, but he quotes it at second-hand.(16) A similar plan, of intermediate reference, was doubtless often pursued by Appian, Dio Cassius, and others of the later compilers. The writers whom they followed had in many cases drawn their accounts from contemporary historians; whom the compiler now extant did not consult, but on whose evidence he thus indirectly relied.

---

(12) Plut. Sull. 37. Sueton. de ill. gramm. c. 12. See Krause, 'Vitæ et Fragmenta veterum Historicorum Romanorum.' — (*Berolini*, 1853), p. 290—296.

(13) Plut. Sull. 25, 6.

(14) Concerning the sources of Plutarch's lives of Marius, Sylla, Sertorius, Lucullus, and Crassus, see Heeren, 'De Font. vit. Plut.' p. 136—162; with respect to the time subsequent to that of the Gracchi, he makes the following remarks:—'Invaluit tunc mos scribendi historiam sui temporis; quo illud lucramur, ut et certissima et accuratissima rerum memoria posteris tradi possit — exstitere itaque illâ ætate multi, qui commentarios rerum suarum conscriberent,' p. 138. Kiene, der Römische Bundesgenossenkrieg, (Leipz. 1845), p. 232, says that Plutarch's Lives of Sylla and Marius are chiefly founded on Sylla's Commentaries. As to the imperfection of the extant accounts of the Cimbrian war of Marius, see Niebuhr, Lect. vol. ii. p. 333. Heeren, ib. p. 151, thinks that Sylla's memoirs were written in Greek. Some passages from them are, however, quoted in Latin: Krause, ib. p. 290-1.

(15) Brut. 35, Cf. de Orat. iii. 8. (Krause, p. 232.)

(16) *ὡς τὸν Κάτλον αὐτὸν ἱστορεῖν λέγουσι μεγαλύνοντα τοὺς στρατιώτας.* Mar. 26.

Before the time of Sylla and Catulus, however, other Romans, engaged in public affairs, had recorded their own actions. P. Rutilius Rufus wrote memoirs of his own life, *De Vitâ Suâ*, in at least five books. This work doubtless included the political events in which he had borne a part. He was prætor in 111 B.C., and consul in 105 B.C.(17) M. Æmilius Scaurus (who was born in 163 and died about 90 B.C.) likewise composed an autobiographical work, in three books, which Cicero commends, but says that it found no readers, although it was more instructive and useful to a Roman than Xenophon's Cyropædia, which was generally read.(18) Scaurus appears to have been the earliest Roman who composed his own memoirs.(19)

L. Otacilius Pilitus had been a slave employed as a porter, and, as was then the custom, had been chained, like a watch-dog, to the door. Having shown natural talent and a fondness for literature, he was manumitted by his master, and he became a professor of rhetoric. In this capacity, he taught the great Pompey; which circumstance led to his composing a memoir of his pupil, as well as of the father, Cn. Pompeius Strabo, in several books. This historical work must have included the events of the Marsic war, and the times of Marius and Sylla, in which Pompeius Strabo bore a part.(20)

A history of Rome, beginning from the foundation of the city, was written by C. Licinius Macer, who was born in the same year as Cicero, and committed suicide in 66 B.C. He made antiquarian researches into authentic documents, and is quoted for events in the early centuries; whether he brought his work down to his own times is uncertain.(21) His history is characterized by Cicero as diffuse in style, overloaded with speeches, and deformed by exaggeration: a description which shows that he had departed from the dry annalistic style of the early Roman historians.(22)

---

(17) Krause, ib. p. 227-30. Lachmann de Font. Liv. Part ii. p. 27. Gräfenhan, 'Geschichte der Klass, Philologie,' vol. ii. p. 400; vol. iv. p. 444. Meyer, 'Fragm. Orat. Rom.' p. 263.

(18) Brut. 29.

(19) Krause, p. 223. These two autobiographies are alluded to by Tacit. Agric. 1. 'Ac plerique suam ipsi vitam narrare, fiduciam potius morum quam arrogantiam arbitrati sunt, nec id Rutilio et Scauro citra fidem aut obtrectationi fuit.' The expression 'citra fidem' shows that their works were considered authentic sources of history.

(20) Suet. de Clar. Rhet. 3. Krause, ubi sup. p. 289.

Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, who belongs to the time of Sylla, wrote a history which began with the capture of Rome by the Gauls. The third book narrated the war with Pyrrhus, the fifth and sixth books included the Second Punic War. In the nineteenth book the siege of Athens by Sylla, and the seventh consulship of Marius, 86 B.C., were described. As the twenty-third book is cited, it has been conjectured that the work ended with the death of Sylla, 78 B.C. Assuming that a historian would collect authentic accounts of events which had occurred within fifty years of his own times, and that he began to write about 90 B.C., he would be an original authority for the period from 140 to 78 B.C.(23)

Contemporary with Claudius Quadrigarius was Q. Valerius Antias, whose voluminous history of Rome reached from the foundation of the city to his own time.(24) Its 75th book is cited by Gellius,(25) and therefore it must have been at least equal in bulk to half Livy's work, if we assume the books to have been of the same length. Facts in the Achæan war of the year 146 B.C., and in the Cimbrian invasion of 105 B.C., are cited from Valerius Antias.(26) He likewise mentioned an anecdote of L. Crassus, the heir of Crassus the orator, which must be of later date than 91 B.C., the epoch of the death of the latter.(27)

---

(21) Krause, ib. p. 235: Lachmann, i. p. 38. Niebuhr, Lect. ib. p. xliii. Meyer, ib. p. 385. Schwegler, Röm. Gesch. vol. i. p. 92.

(22) Nam quid Macrum numerem? cujus loquacitas habet aliquid argutiarum, (nec id tamen ex illâ eruditâ Græcorum copiâ, sed ex librariolis Latinis), in orationibus autem multus et ineptus; elatio summa impudentia. De Leg. i. 2.

(23) Krause, ib. p. 243—65. Lachmann, ib. p. 34; Niebuhr, p. xl. Velleius, ii. 9, states that Rutilius (whose autobiography has been already mentioned), Claudius Quadrigarius, and Valerius Antias were contemporaries of Sisenna, who appears to have been born about 120, B.C. (Krause, p. 300), but that Cælius Antipater was earlier than Sisenna.

(24) Krause, p. 266—288. Lachmann, i. p. 36; ii. p. 24. Niebuhr, Lect., p. xlii.

(25) vii. 9. § 17.

This period, though anterior to the flourishing age of Latin literature, likewise gave birth to other historical productions. Thus Cn. Aufidius, who was an old man when Cicero was a boy, was addicted to literary pursuits, and, notwithstanding his blindness, composed a history in the Greek language, which is conjectured, from the extant fragments, to have been a Roman history, from the foundation of the city to nearly his own time.(28) L. Cornelius Sisenna was born about the year 120 B.C., and was prætor in 78 B.C.(29) He is enumerated by Cicero in the series of Roman orators; and is described by him as a man of literary cultivation, well acquainted with public affairs, and using a good Latin style. As a historian, Cicero considers him far superior to all his predecessors, though inferior to the best Greek writers of history.(30) His 'Historiæ' were contained in twelve or fourteen books, and extended from the Marsic war to the Civil war of Sylla and Marius (90 to 78 B.C.). His life coincided with this entire period, of which he was a contemporary historian in the strictest sense of the word. According to Sallust, he wrote the best account of Sylla, though he did not speak out with sufficient freedom ;(31) which is the fault of a contemporary writer. Lucullus, likewise, who had served in the Marsic war, composed a history of it in Greek ;(32) and L. Lucceius, the friend of Cicero, undertook and partly completed a contemporary history of Rome, commencing with that war.(33)

---

(26) See Oros. v. 3 and 16. Orosius, however, doubtless borrowed these citations of Valerius Antias from Livy; see Epit. 52 and 67.

(27) Plin. N. H. xxxiv. 8. Compare Cic. Brut. 58. Gellius, vii. 9, § 12, quotes a passage from the *twelfth* book of the histories of Valerius Antias, referring to an event of the year 137 B.C., when Tib. Gracchus was quartered in Spain. Krause, p. 274, considers the number corrupt, and for xii. proposes to read xl. Conjectural alterations of numbers in the texts of ancient writers are always uncertain: but if Valerius Antias included the whole Roman history from the foundation of the city to the time of Tib. Gracchus in twelve books, and if the subsequent period occupied at least sixty-three books, the later years must have been treated on a scale of disproportionate fulness. If we adopt the emendation of Krause, the period down to Tib. Gracchus—about 600 years—would have been concluded in forty books, and the remaining fifty or sixty years might have occupied about thirty-five books.

(28) Cic. Tusc. Quæst. v. 38. De Fin. v. 19. Krause, p. 299.

(29) Krause, ib. p. 299—317. Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 180.

(30) Brut. 64. De Leg. i. 2.

§ 3 P. Sempronius Asellio, who was a military tribune under Scipio Africanus, in the Numantine war (134 B.C.), is stated by Gellius to have written a history of the events in which he bore a part.(34) He is cited for facts respecting Tib. Gracchus and P. Crassus Mucianus, the latter for the year 131 B.C. Cicero describes him as a successor of Cælius Antipater, but as having degenerated from the standard of that historian, and as having returned to the feeble and unpolished style of the earlier writers.(35) Nevertheless, some curious passages from his work, preserved by Gellius, show that he was dissatisfied with the jejune style of a mere annalist, and required that a history should set forth the causes and motives of actions.(36)

---

(31) L. Sisenna optime et diligentissime omnium, qui eas res dixere, persecutus, parum mihi libero ore locutus videtur. Jug. 95.

(32) Plut. Lucull. 1 and 2.

(33) Cic. Ep. ad Fam. v. 12. Lucan describes the aged men, at the eruption of the civil war between Pompey and Cæsar, recurring to the miseries which they had witnessed in their youth during the civil war between Marius and Sylla.

'Talis pietas peritura querelas
Egerit; at miseros angit sua cura parentes,
Oderuntque gravis vivacia fata senectæ,
Servatosque iterum bellis civilibus annos.—ii. 63-6.

He then describes a long reminiscence of this kind,—and adds,

'Sic mœsta senectus,
Præteritique memor flebat, metuensque futuri.'—ii., 232.

As only thirty-four years intervened between these two civil wars, the supposition which Lucan makes is quite within the bounds of nature. Dio Cassius, xli. 16, likewise speaks of the contemporaries of Cæsar as remembering the times of Marius and Sylla. Cicero reports a conversation which he had had with Marius, when he was 'summâ senectute.' Post red. ad Quir. 8. Cicero was twenty years old when Marius died. Marius was his senior by fifty-one years.

(34) Res eas quibus gerendis ipse interfuit, conscripsit. Gell. ii. 13. His work was entitled '*Res gestæ.*' See Krause, p. 216, who supposes Asellio to have been born about 164 B.C.

(35) De Leg. 1, 2.

(36) Gell. v. 18. Krause p. 218. The conjecture of Krause that his work went back to the Punic wars is improbable. The expression of Gellius seems to confine it to contemporary memoirs.

Cneius Gellius lived in the age of the Gracchi, and wrote a historical work of considerable extent, beginning from the earliest period of Rome, and perhaps reaching to his own time. A fact belonging to the period soon after the Gallic conflagration is cited from the fifteenth book of his annals ; and a fact from the Second Punic War is cited from the thirtieth or thirty-third book. Censorinus refers to him for an event of the year 146 B.C., and the ninety-seventh book is cited by Charisius ; but the number may be corrupt.(37)

The principal historian of this period was however L. Cælius Antipater, contemporary with the Gracchi, and earlier than Sisenna.(38) He wrote a history, beginning with the Punic wars, in not less than seven books. Cicero cites his work as if it related only to the Punic wars ;(39) but he is also adduced as an authority for a fact relating to C. Gracchus, which he reported as a personal witness :(40) and unless we suppose that this was contained in a separate work, we must assume that his history extended to his own time. Cælius Antipater is described by Cicero as having infused more nerve and vigour than his predecessors, into his historical style ; but as being deficient in polish and refinement.(41) It is mentioned that the Emperor Hadrian was fond of the antique style ; and preferred Cato to

---

(37) Krause, p. 202-9. Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1. p. xxxviii.

(38) Krause, ib. p. 182. Lachmann, De Font. Liv. ii. p. 19. He is only quoted by Livy for the events of the second Punic war.—ib. p. 22. Drumann, vol. ii. p. 422.

(39) Orator, c. 69.

(40) Cic. Div. i. 26. Val. Max. i. 7, § 6. The passage of Cicero is cited by Plut. C. Gracch. 1.

(41) Paululum se erexit, et addidit historiæ majorem sonum vocis vir optimus, Crassi familiaris, Antipater ; cæteri non exornatores rerum, sed tantummodo narratores fuerunt. Est, inquit Catulus, ut dicis, sed iste ipse Cælius neque distraxit historiam varietate locorum, neque verborum collocatione et tractu orationis levi et æquabili perpolivit illud opus ; sed ut homo neque doctus neque maxime aptus ad dicendum, sicut potuit, dolavit ; vicit tamen, ut dicis, superiores. De Orat. ii. 12, 13. L. Cælius Antipater scriptor (quemadmodum videtis) fuit, ut temporibus illis, luculentus, juris valde peritus, multorum etiam, ut L. Crassi, magister. Brut. 26. [L. Crassus was born in 140 B.C.] Fannii autem ætati conjunctus Antipater paulo inflavit vehementius, habuitque vires agrestes ille quidem atque horridas, sine nitore ac palæstrâ ; sed tamen admonere reliquos potuit, ut accuratius scriberent.—De Leg. i, 2.

Cicero, Ennius to Virgil, and Cælius to Sallust;(42) as if any one now were to prefer Chaucer to Milton, and Holinshed to Hume. Brutus testified to the merit of Cælius by making an abridgment of his work.(43)

Some more names still remain to be mentioned of Romans who wrote the history of their own time, and who flourished near the end of the second century before Christ. C. Sempronius Tuditanus was consul in 129 B.C., and composed a historical work (of which the thirteenth book is cited), entitled 'Commentarii,' beginning at the earliest times of the city, and perhaps reaching to his own age.(44) Cicero praises the elegance of his oratory, but makes no mention of his historical writings.(45) He is cited for the early mythical history, for the first tribunes of the people, for the death of Regulus, and for the triumph of Flaminius in 194 B.C.(46) C. Fannius was quæstor in 139, and prætor in 137, B.C., during the Numantine war. He had been the disciple of Panætius, and he composed a Roman history in Latin, in a jejune, but not inelegant style.(47) Sallust praised the work of Fannius for its veracity, and Brutus thought it worthy of an abridgment.(48) The citations from his history relate to his own times, and, indeed, the praise of Sallust seems to indicate that it was a contemporary memoir. It is quoted for an exploit of Tib. Gracchus, in 146 B.C., in which Fannius was personally concerned:(49) for the oration of L. Metellus against Tib. Gracchus, in 133 B.C., and for a fact concerning P. Rupilius, of the year 123 B.C.(50)

---

(42) Spartian, c. 16.

(43) Cic. ad Att. xiii. 8.

(44) Krause, ib. p. 178-82.

(45) Brut. 25.

(46) Plut. Flaminin. 14, where the reading *οἱ περὶ Τουδιτανὸν* rests on manuscript authority. See ed. Sintenis, vol. ii. p. 207. Compare Livy, xxxiv. 52. Dion. Hal. i. 11, includes Cato and Sempronius among the *λογιώτατοι τῶν Ῥωμαίων συγγραφέων*.

(47) Nam post annales pontificum maximorum, quibus nihil potest esse jejunius, si aut ad Fabium, aut ad eum, qui tibi semper in ore est, Catonem, aut ad Pisonem, aut ad Fannium, aut ad Vennonium venias; quanquam ex his alius alio plus habet virium, tamen quid tam exile quam isti omnes? Cic. Leg. i. 2. Ejus [C. Fannii] omnis in dicendo facultas ex historiâ ipsius non ineleganter scriptâ perspici potest; quæ neque nimis est infans, neque perfecte diserta. Brut. 26.

(48) Sallust., Fragm. Hist., l. 3, ed. Kritz. Cic. Ep. ad Att. xii. 5.

(49) *λέγων καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ Τιβερίῳ συνεπιβῆναι καὶ συμμετασχεῖν ἐκείνης τῆς ἀριστείας.*—Plut. Tib. Gracch. 4.

L. Cassius Hemina was living in the year 146 B.C., when Carthage and Corinth were taken,(51) but he was probably somewhat older than Fannius, who was present at the taking of Carthage. He wrote a Roman history in Latin, beginning with the earliest times, and reaching to near his own age.(52) Only five books of it are cited. The second book included the burning of Rome by the Gauls; the third book mentioned an incident of the year 219 B.C., and therefore concluded the first Punic war. The fourth book was inscribed *Bellum Punicum posterior* (instead of *posterius*); but it reached at least as far as the year 181 B.C.(53) The fifth book probably brought down the history to his own time; to which the fact of the year 146 B.C. belongs.(54)

L. Calpurnius Piso was tribune of the people in 149, and consul in 133 B.C., the year in which Tib. Gracchus was slain. He wrote a historical work, inscribed 'Annales,' in the antique meagre style of a chronicle.(55) His history began from the earliest times of Rome, and appears to have been carried down to his own time, as he mentioned in it the secular games of 146 B.C.(56) It seems to have consisted of about seven books. The first book included the early mythical history, and the period of the kings; in the second he spoke of the war with Porsena, the battle of lake Regillus, the secession of the plebs, and the alteration in the election of tribunes in 471 B.C. In the third book he mentioned an event of the year 304 B.C.; in the seventh an event of 158 B.C.(57)

---

(50) Meyer, Fragm. Orat. Rom., p. 160. Krause, p. 171-5.

(51) Censorin. De die nat., c. 17.

(52) Krause, ib. p. 155-66.

(53) Niebuhr, Lect., vol. 1, p. xxxvi. infers from the title of the fourth book that it was written before the third Punic war.

(54) Pliny, N.H., xiii.13, calls Hemina 'vetustissimus auctor annalium,' xxxix. , 'ex antiquis auctor:' expressions indicative of the recency of historical writing in Rome, when a historian who lived about 150 B.C. could be described as 'very ancient.'

(55) Reliquit—annales, sane exiliter scriptos, Cic. Brut. 27. Compare De Orat. ii. 12. Leg. i. 2, where Piso is mentioned as an example of the old unimproved annalistic style: like that of the medieval chronicles.

(56) Censorin. De D. N., c. 17.

§ 4 The Roman history during the period over which we have been travelling was chiefly written by natives, who had either taken part in the events described, or were otherwise conversant with public affairs. Some contributions to it were however made by Greek writers; thus Juba, the king of Numidia, who lived under Augustus, and was a voluminous writer in the Greek language, composed a Roman history which reached from the primitive period to the times of Sylla and Sertorius.(58) Strabo the geographer continued the history of Polybius to his own time, probably to the accession of Augustus.(59) The most celebrated continuator of Polybius was, however, Posidonius, whose history, extending from 146 to 96 B.C., or to a later date, occupied more than fifty books. He likewise wrote a history of Pompey the Great. Posidonius appears to have lived from 136 to 51 B.C., and therefore was contemporary with the chief part of the period included in his history. He was likewise a personal witness of many of the events which he related. Thus he had an interview with Marius, in his last illness, as ambassador from Rhodes to Rome,(60) and had accompanied Pompey in his Asiatic campaigns.(61) The curious account of the Servile war in Sicily, in the remains of the thirty-fourth book of Diodorus, appears to be borrowed from Posidonius.(62)

---

(57) See Krause, ib. p. 139-55. Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1, p. xxxviii. Lachmann, De Font. Liv. 1, p. 32.

(58) See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 471; Egger, Examen des Hist. anc. d'Auguste, p. 94.

(59) Ib. p. 490-4.

(60) Plut. Mar. 45, Fragm. Hist. Gr. ib. p. 266.

(61) Ib. p. 290. Strab. xi. 1, § 6.

(62) Ib. Fragm. 15 from the 8th book. (134 B.C.) Kiene, Röm. Bundesgenossenkrieg, p. 318, thinks that both Appian and Plutarch, in their account of the wars of Sylla and Marius, made great use of Posidonius. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 104, believes Appian's account of the troubles in the times of the Gracchi to have been borrowed from Posidonius. Compare Heeren, De Font. Plut., p. 28-9. Concerning the History of Pompey's Campaigns, by Theophanes of Mytilene, see above, p. 21, n. 6.

The lifetime of Polybius extended from about 204 to 122 B.C.(63) His Universal History properly begins in 220 B.C., and ends in 146 B.C. — the year of the taking of Corinth and the final destruction of Greek independence. The chief part of this period of seventy-four years falls within his own lifetime; and he was personally concerned in many of the events which he narrated. After having taken a leading part in the affairs of his own country, Polybius was transferred with the other Achæan hostages to Italy, in 167 B.C. He here became attached, as an instructor, adviser, and friend, to Scipio Africanus Minor, the son of Æmilius Paulus, the conqueror of Macedonia, when he was a youth, and accompanied him subsequently in his campaigns.(64) Polybius declares that he was an eyewitness of most of the events narrated in his history; that in some he participated, and in others was the principal agent.(65) Elsewhere he says that the transactions included in his history occurred either in his own time, or in that of the preceding generation, so that he had either witnessed them himself, or received an account of them from personal witnesses.(66) He was present at the final capture and destruction of Carthage; he there heard Scipio utter the verses of Homer which that great catastrophe recalled to his mind, and inquired the sense in which he applied them.(67) Afterwards, in the same year, he was present at the taking of Corinth; and he described the lamentable sack of the town, and the disregard of the works of art, as a personal spectator: among other things, he mentioned having seen pictures thrown on the ground, and the soldiers playing at dice upon them.(68) He prefixed, moreover, two introductory books, comprising the events of an earlier period; and connecting with the conclusion of the history of Timæus, for the purpose of illustrating the first passage of the Romans out of Italy.(69) In these he describes the First Punic War, and the Carthaginian war of the mercenaries (264—38, B.C.) (70); the Illyrian war (229 B.C.); and the wars with the Gauls, from 390 to 222 B.C.; he also includes the history of the Achæan league, and of the war with Cleomenes. (280—20 B.C.) He was assisted, in his account of the Achæan league, by the very trustworthy and perspicuous memoirs of his own acts, composed by Aratus; for the rest, he promises a more accurate and painstaking narrative.(71)

---

(63) Clinton, F. H., vol. iii. p. 119, says: 'His birth could not be earlier than 210 B.C., his death could not be earlier than 129 B.C.'

(64) Polyb. xxxii. 9-16.

(65) τὸ δὲ μέγιστον διὰ τὸ τῶν πλείστων μὴ μόνον αὐτόπτης, ἀλλ' ὧν μὲν συνεργὸς, ὧν δὲ καὶ χειριστὴς γεγονέναι.—iii. 4.

(66) δεύτερον δὲ διὰ τὸ καὶ τοὺς χρόνους οὕτω συντρέχειν τοὺς ἑξῆς καὶ τοὺς πίπτοντας ὑπὸ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἱστορίαν, ὥστε τοὺς μὲν καθ' ἡμᾶς εἶναι τοὺς δὲ κατὰ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, ἐξ οὗ συμβαίνει τοῖς μὲν αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς παραγεγονέναι, τὰ δὲ παρὰ τῶν ἑωρακότων ἀκηκοέναι.—iv. 2.

(67) Πολυβίου δ' αὐτὸν ἐρομένου σὺν παῤῥησίᾳ (καὶ γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῦ καὶ διδάσκαλος) ὅτι βούλοιτο ὁ λόγος, φασὶν οὐ φυλαξάμενον ὀνομάσαι τὴν πατρίδα σαφῶς . . καὶ τάδε μὲν Πολύβιος αὐτὸς ἀκούσας συγγράφει.—Appian Pun., 132.

C. Acilius Glabrio, a senator, who was quæstor in 203, and was still alive in 155 B.C., wrote a 'History of Rome,' in Greek, beginning at the earliest times, and continued to his own age. It is quoted by Livy for events of the years 212 and 193 B.C.(72) It was translated into Latin by one Claudius.(73)

---

(68) Strabo, viii. 6, § 23. For other personal anecdotes of Polybius at this time, see Polyb. xl. 8-10. See also xxxvii. 2 a. Bekker. Polybius likewise reported two sayings of Cato, in which he was personally interested. When the question of the return of the Achæan hostages was debated in the Senate in 151 B.C. and much difference of opinion existed, Cato, who had been applied to by Scipio, on account of Polybius, settled the matter by rising, and exclaiming, that they were losing their time in sitting a whole day to decide whether some old Greeks should be buried in Italy or in Achæa. A few days after the permission had been given for the return of the hostages, Polybius sounded Cato as to the policy of applying to the Senate for another decree, that the hostages should on their return be restored to their former honours and position. Cato smiled, and said that Polybius resembled Ulysses, when he wished to re-enter the cave of the Cyclops, in order to recover the cap and girdle which he had left there. Plut. Cat. Maj. 9. Polybius likewise described himself as having conversed at Sardis with the wife of Ortiagon, the Gaulish chief; whose exploit in killing the Roman centurion was celebrated.—xxii. 21.

(69) Polyb. i. 5.

(70) Respecting Polybius as the historian of the First Punic War, see Arnold, 'Hist. of Rome,' vol. ii. p. 562.

(71) ii. 40. Concerning the memoirs of Aratus, see Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 21-3. The work is stated to have contained thirty books. Biogr. Gr. ed. Westermann, p. 55.

(72) Livy xxv. 39; xxxv. 14.

(73) See Krause, ib. p. 84-7; Lachmann, De Font. Liv. ii. p. 23; Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1. p. xxxi; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 97. In Livy

§ 5 We have now reached the epoch of the earliest Roman historian who composed his work in his native language.(74) M. Porcius Cato, the Elder, who was probably born in 234, and who died in 149 B.C., wrote in his old age (about 170 B.C.) his celebrated historical work, entitled 'Origines,' in seven books. The first book contained the history of the Roman kings; the second and third, the origins of the several Italian cities (whence the title of the work). The fourth book contained the First,(75) and the fifth book the Second Punic War. In the two remaining books he narrated the other wars of Rome, down to the expedition of Serv. Sulpicius Galba against the Lusitanians, in the year 150 B.C., but more succinctly than in the account of the Punic wars, and without naming the generals who commanded.(76) The first Punic war began in 264 B.C., just thirty years before Cato's birth. Even for the contents of the fourth book of his history, his information was recent; but the beginning of the Second Punic War falls within his lifetime (218 B.C.), and for the sixty-eight years, down to 150 B.C., included in the last three books,

---

Epit. 53, the manuscripts have 'C. Julius senator Græce res Romanas scribit,' where the name *C. Julius* seems evidently corrupt, as nothing is heard of such a historian elsewhere. Two emendations suggest themselves as probable, *Acilius* and *Albinus*: but neither can be reconciled with the date, (viz. 142 B.C.) under which Livy inserts this notice. Acilius was quæstor in 203 B.C., and it is not possible that a person who was quæstor in 203 B.C. could have been engaged in writing history sixty years afterwards. Nevertheless, the name *Acilius* has been admitted into the text upon conjecture by Jahn, the latest editor of Livy's Epitomes. A. Posthumius Albinus, who was consul in 151 B.C., made himself conspicuous by his excessive love of the Greek language and literature, and he wrote a poem and a history in Greek. See Cic. Brut. 21; Gell. xi. 8; Polyb. xl. 6; Plut. Cat. Maj. 12; Krause, ib. p. 127. The consulship of Albinus in 151 B.C. agrees with Livy's date; but a saying of Cato upon the history of Albinus, after it had been published, is preserved, and Cato died in 149 B.C., several years before the time when Livy describes the historian as engaged upon his work. As the Greek history of Albinus seems to have attracted more notice than that of Acilius, perhaps the most probable supposition is that *Albinus* is the name, and that Livy misplaced his time by a few years.

(74) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 8.

(75) Several of the extant citations from the fourth book of the Origines refer to the First Punic War, Krause, p. 109.

(76) Nepos, Cat. 3. Pliny, N. H. viii. 5, also alludes to the fact of his omitting the names of the generals in his history.

and comprising the wars with Philip, Antiochus, and Perseus, he was, strictly speaking, a contemporary writer.

It seems strange that Cato should, in his 'Origines,' have passed over the long and important period of 246 years, from the expulsion of the kings to the First Punic War.(77) The most probable explanation of this fact appears to be, that he began his history as a work of *Origins*: his first book contained the origin of Rome, the second and third books contained the origins of the other Italian cities.(78) These three books apparently fulfilled the primitive design; but having commenced historical composition, he appended to his work an account of the recent history of his country, so far as his own memory and that of the preceding generation extended.(79) He therefore added to his work on 'Origins,' strictly so called, four books of the recent history of Rome, beginning with the First Punic War, and ending in 150 B.C.; thus extending over 114 years, of which period eighty-four years were included in his own lifetime. The result of this expansion of the primitive plan of the work was, that the larger part of Cato's 'Origines' did not relate to Italian origins, but was a recent history of his own country.(80)

---

(77) Blum, Einleitung in Roms alte Geschichte, p. 112.

(78) This part of the work is alluded to by Fronto: 'Cato oppidatim statuis ornandus, qui primam Latini nominis sobolem, et Italicarum originum pueritias illustravit.' Princip. Hist. 9. (p. 252, ed. Niebuhr.)

(79) Livy xxxiv. 15 cites Cato's testimony for an event in which he himself bore a part, of the year 195 B.C., and calls him 'haud sane detrectator laudum suarum;' regarding him as a historical witness concerning his own exploits. The speech for the Rhodians, which Cato delivered in 167 B.C., was reported by himself in the fifth book of his Origines: 'Ipsius oratio scripta extat, Originum quinto libro inclusa,' says Livy, xlv. 25. See Gell. vii. 3; Meyer, Fragm. Orat. Rom. p. 102. His speech against S. Sulpicius Galba, delivered in 149 B.C., the last year of his life, was also reported in the 7th book of his Origines: Livy, Epit. 49; Cic. Brut. 23.; Gell. xiii. 24; Meyer, ib. p. 120.

(80) This circumstance is pointed out by Festus, p. 198. 'Originum libros quod inscripsit Cato, non satis plenum titulum propositi sui videtur amplexus, quando prægravant ea, quæ sunt rerum gestarum populi Romani.' Pliny, N.H. viii. 5, and Livy, Epit. 49, call the work of Cato, Annales. Plut., Cat. Maj. 20, calls it *ἱστορίαι*. Concerning Cato's Origines, see Krause, ib. p. 80—125. Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1, p. xxxv.; Lachmann, De Font. Liv. ii. p. 17.; Drumann, vol. v. p. 145. Some of the cases which Livy represents L. Valerius, the tribune, as citing against Cato

A writer named Posidonius, who was not only a contemporary, but also personally engaged in some of the events of the time, wrote a 'History of Perseus', in several books. It is cited by Plutarch in the 'Life of Æmilius Paulus,' and contained an account of the war of the Romans with Perseus, in 171-68 B.C.(81)

Some contributions were likewise made to the history of these times by members of the family of Scipio. Thus Scipio Africanus the First, published a letter to Philip king of Macedon, in which he set forth the views with which he directed his campaigns in Spain, and his attack upon Carthage.(82) Scipio Nasica, his son-in-law, likewise wrote a similar memoir, addressed to one of the Greek kings, respecting the war with Perseus.(83) Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus, the son of the first Africanus, wrote a history in Greek, which was probably a contemporary memoir.(84)

§ 6 Having reached the time of the Second Punic War, we have arrived at the two writers who stand at the commencement of the series of native historians of Rome. L. Cincius Alimentus, a senator, lived in the Second Punic War. He was prætor in the year 210 B.C., and continued to hold public offices in the following years. He was taken prisoner during the war, and learned from Hannibal himself some particulars respecting his passage of the Rhone, and his march into Italy, which he recorded in his history.(85) This work, written in Greek, reached from the foundation of the city to his own times. It was concise in the early ages, but fuller in the later period, where he could

---

from his own *Origines*, could not in fact have been in the work: viz. the embassy of the matrons to Coriolanus, and the contribution of the matrons towards the Gallic ransom.—xxxiv. 5.

(81) Plut. Æmil. 19. See Fragm. Hist. Gr., vol. iii. p. 172.

(82) Polyb. x. 9. Polybius speaks of being guided by the testimony of those who had lived with Scipio: *ἡ τῶν συμβεβιωκότων μαρτυρία.*

(83) Plut. Æmil. Paul. 15. P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum, was consul in 162 and 155 B.C., and pontifex maximus in 150 B.C.

(84) Cic. Brut. 20, calls it 'historia quædam Græca, scripta dulcissime.' See Vell. i. 10; Krause, ib. p. 83.

(85) Livy, xxi. 38, who calls him 'maximus auctor.' Hannibal was doubtless able to converse in Greek, and Cincius was master of the Greek language.

write from personal knowledge of the events.(86) Q. Fabius Pictor is the most ancient Roman who wrote the history of his own country. He served in the great Gallic war of 225 B.C., in which L. Æmilius defeated the Gauls in Etruria,(87) and afterwards in the Second Punic War. After the battle of Cannæ, in 216 B.C., he was sent by the Senate to Delphi, in order to consult the oracle as to the best mode of propitiating the gods.(88) His history, which like that of Cincius was written in Greek, began from the foundation of the city, and was continued to his own time(89): he is cited by Livy for the battle of Thrasymene, in 217 B.C.(90) It is stated by Polybius, that one of his reasons for prefixing a summary account of the First Punic War, is, that Philinus and Fabius, the two historians who seem to have written upon it with the highest authority as personal witnesses, have been misled by their partiality—the former against, the latter for the Romans. He attributes this, not to deliberate dishonesty, but to strong prejudice; their character excluded the former, while their position accounted for the latter.(91) Fabius the historian was probably born about 255-250 B.C., and if he lived sixty years, he would have died about 195-190 B.C.(92) He might, therefore, have remembered the First Punic War, which ended in 241 B.C., but he could not have observed it as a historical witness. Polybius likewise disputes the explanation of the cause of the Second Punic War, given by Fabius. He has no fear lest the account given by himself should not be preferred to that of Fabius; but he is desirous of guarding the readers of Fabius against thinking that because he lived at the time, and was a Roman senator, therefore all he says is true. Polybius does not deny that Fabius is a historian of considerable authority, but he advises the reader not to trust him implicitly, or to make an entire surrender of his own judgment on the facts recounted.(93) Fabius Pictor is classed by Cicero with Cato, Piso, Fannius, and others, as exemplifying the antique meagre annalistic style of Roman history; nothing can be more jejune than all of them, he remarks, though one may be more forcible than another.(94)

---

(86) Dion. Hal. i. 6, says that the accounts of the early Roman history given by Hieronymus, Timæus, and other Greek writers, were brief and unsatisfactory, and that the works of the Roman historians who wrote in Greek had the same defect. The most ancient of these, he adds, were Q. Fabius and L. Cincius, who both flourished during the Punic wars:—*Τούτων δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἑκάτερος, οἷς μὲν αὐτὸς ἔργοις παρεγίνετο, διὰ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀκριβῶς ἀνέγραψε, τὰ δὲ ἀρχαῖα τὰ μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν τῆς πόλεως γενόμενα κεφαλαιωδῶς ἐπέδραμε.* Dionysius elsewhere says that he states a fact in early Roman history, *Κοίντῳ Φαβίῳ βεβαιωτῇ χρώμενος, καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἔτι δεόμενος πίστεως ἑτέρας. παλαιότατος γὰρ ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ Ῥωμαϊκὰ συνταξαμένων, καὶ πίστιν οὐκ ἐξ ὧν ἤκουσε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς ἔγνω, παρεχόμενος.* vii. 71. M. Cincius Alimentus, tribune of the plebs in 204 B C. (Livy, xxix. 20), and author of the law De Donis et Muneribus, was doubtless a member of the same family. Concerning Cincius the historian, see Krause, ib. p. 63—75; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 94—7; Lachmann, De Font. Liv. i. p. 29. ii. p. 16; Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1. p. xxx. Blum, Einleitung, p. 66.

(87) L. Æmilio consule [225 B.C.] ingentes Gallorum copiæ Alpes transierunt. Sed pro Romanis tota Italia consensit, traditumque est a Fabio historico, qui ei bello interfuit, DCCC millia hominum parata ad id bellum fuisse. Eutrop. iii. 5. L. Æmilio Papo, C. Atilio Regulo consulibus, magnâ formidine consternatus est senatus, defectione Cisalpinæ Galliæ. . . . Itaque permoti consules, totius Italiæ ad præsidium imperii contraxere vires. Quo facto, in utriusque consulis exercitu octingenta millia armatorum fuisse referuntur, sicut Fabius historicus, qui eidem bello interfuit scripsit. Oros. iv. 13. The statement that the force of the Romans and their allies in this year amounted to 800,000 men agrees with that in Polyb. ii. 24, who makes the infantry above 700,000, and the cavalry 70,000. The account of the strength of the two consular armies is independent of the other statement. Compare Fischer Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 84.

(88) Livy xxii. 57; xxiii. 11. Appian, Hannib. 27; Plut. Fab. 18.

(89) Dion. Hal. i. 6, Appian, ubi sup. The 'Græci Annales' of Numerius Fabius Pictor, from which Cicero, De Div. i. 21, quotes an account of the dream of Æneas, are probably no other than the work of this historian, whose prænomen Cicero mistakes.

(90) Livy, xxii. 7, where he says: 'Ego, præterquam quod nihil haustum ex vano velim, *quo nimis inclinant fere scribentium animi,* Fabium æqualem temporibus hujusce belli potissimum auctorem habui.'

---

(91) i. 14. τοὺς ἐμπειρότατα δοκοῦντας γράφειν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ.

(92) Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. 286, says that Fabius wrote his history in Olymp. 148, 1.—188 B.C. In another place however he supposes Fabius to have written it one hundred years after the Etruscan war of 310 B.C., i. e. about 210 B.C., ib. p. 381, which is probably nearer the truth.

(93) iii. 8 and 9. The credibility of Fabius is defended against the remarks of Polybius, by Ernesti, Opuscula Philologica, p. 102—112.

(94) De Orat. ii. 12; De Leg. i. 2. Concerning Fabius, the historian, see Krause, ib. p. 38—63; Lachmann de Font. Liv. i. p. 62; ii. p. 14; Niebuhr, Lect. p. xxvi; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 80—93. Fabius Pictor, the flamen Quirinalis, mentioned by Livy, xxxvii. 47, 50, 51, xlv. 44, appears to be the son of the historian. His death falls in 167 B.C. (Krause, p. 40.) The name Pictor in the Fabian gens is stated by Pliny to have originated with Fabius who painted the temple of Salus in 450 U.C. (304 B.C.); and the painting was preserved until his time, when the temple was burnt under the Emperor Claudius,

§ 7 The wars of Hannibal were written by Silenus and Sosilus, who had accompanied him in his campaigns, and lived with him at other times:(95) from the latter he had learnt Greek. The diligence of Silenus is commended by Cicero;(96) he is quoted by Livy for an event in the Second Punic War;(97) other citations appear to refer to the same period. Silenus is classed by Dionysius with Hieronymus, Timæus, Antigonus, and Polybius, as an authority on the early ages of Rome.(98) He charges all these writers with having written Roman history negligently and inaccurately, and from unverified rumours; which charge is certainly not true as respects Polybius, whatever applicability it may have to the others. Philinus of Agrigentum, the historian of the First Punic War, accused by Polybius of partiality to the Carthaginians, and hostility towards Rome, was contemporary with the events which he narrated, and perhaps an actor in them. The destruction of Agrigentum, which was apparently the cause of his enmity to the Romans, took place in 262 B.C., and his history was doubtless composed after this event.(99)

N.H. xxxv. 7; Val. Max. viii. 14, 6. C. Fabius Pictor, who was consul in 269 B.C., and Num. Fabius Pictor, who was ambassador to Ptolemy in 273 (Val. Max. iv. 3, 9) and consul in 266 B.C., appear to have been the sons of C. Fabius the painter; and one of them to have been the father of Q. Fabius Pictor the historian. See Pauly, Encycl. vol. vi. Nachtrag. These dates are consistent with the supposition that the historian was born about 255—50 B.C.

(95) Nepos Hannibal, ad fin.; Krause, p. 88; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 99, 100; Lachmann, De Font. Liv. i. p. 28. Sosilus wrote the history of Hannibal in seven books, Diod. xxvi. 4. Polybius speaks contemptuously of him, iii. 20.

(96) Div. i. 24. Cicero quotes Silenus as his authority for the dream of Hannibal, which encouraged him to invade Italy. Compare Livy xxi. 22; Val. Max. i. 7. 1, ext. Zon. viii. 22; Silius, iii. 163—221. Cicero however does not say that Silenus obtained the account of the dream from Hannibal himself, as Dr. Arnold states, vol. iii. p. 70: though it is possible that this was the case. Compare ib. p. 132.

(97) Livy xxvi. 49.

(98) i. 6. The age of Antiochus is unknown: see Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 305.

(99) See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 17; Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. xxvii. Dr. Arnold remarks that 'it was a Greek who gave what may be looked upon as the Carthaginian account of the First Punic War.'—vol. ii. p. 556. A writer named Altius (of whom nothing else is known) is cited 'libro primo belli Carthaginiensis,' as an authority for the origin of the Mamertini in Messana, by Festus in Mamertini, p. 158. Compare Krause, p. 131, note.

§ 8 If therefore we trace the Roman history back from the dictatorship of Julius Cæsar, we find that its events were fully recorded by intelligent, trustworthy, and well-informed contemporary writers, up to the beginning of the Gallic war of 225 B.C. Up to that period, the majority of these historians were native Romans, though some of them, and particularly those of the earlier time, wrote in Greek. For the period of thirty-nine years between the beginning of the First Punic War, and the Gallic war (264—225 B.C.), there were no native historians who were personal witnesses of the events of the day: but they lived with the generation who were actors in them, and were able to obtain their information from sources of unquestionable authenticity. The First Punic War was narrated by one Greek at least, who lived during its progress, and probably other Sicilian historians at the time wrote its history.

It is true that the native historians of Rome, from Fabius Pictor down to Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias, did not hold a high rank as artists; that their manner was in general dry, stiff, and jejune; that they were deficient in philosophical spirit; and that their historical style resembled rather that of a medieval chronicle, or of such writers as Holinshed, or Stow, than the work of Thucydides, which they might have imitated, or the works of Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus, which their own subsequent literature produced.(100) Cicero will not even allow them the name of historians.(101) So inferior were they to the Greek writers in that line of composition, that he regards them as mere annalists, or memoir writers, as mere mechanical registrars of facts, without any claim to the higher attributes of the historian. He compares the Roman writers of history before his time to the Greek logographers, who were prior to Herodotus, —Pherecydes, Hellanicus, and Acusilaus. According to the Roman standard of history, he says, the only requisite is, that the writer should tell the truth; the style of his composition is immaterial. They studied only to express their meaning in the smallest number of words consistent with being understood. Their model was the official annals of the year kept by the Pontifex Maximus. Cicero wished himself to produce a history which should equal those of the Greek writers; as Virgil attempted to rival Homer, and Horace the Greek lyric poets.(102) He looks upon history chiefly as a work of art, and as a composition fitted for an orator.(103) Sallust likewise contrasts the celebrity of the great deeds of the Athenians with the comparative obscurity of the great deeds of the Romans: and he attributes this difference to the efforts of the distinguished men who wrote the history of Athens; whereas at Rome the ablest men were occupied, not in writing, but in action; and were more solicitous of gaining a great name for themselves than in narrating the exploits of

---

(100) Nullum sit verbum velut rubigine infectum; nulli sensus tardâ et inerti structurâ, *in morem annalium*, componantur. Tacit. de Caus. Corr. Eloq. 22. He seems to refer to histories written in the antique style. *Sensus* is here used in the general meaning of *sentence*; see Ernesti, Lex. Techn. Lat. in v.

(101) In the Dialogue de Legibus, Atticus says to Cicero: 'Abest historia a litteris nostris, ut et ipse intelligo, et ex te persæpe audio.' i. 2. Atticus himself wrote a chronological epitome of Roman affairs from the earliest period down to his own time, in a single book. It contained much information on the descents of the great families. See Nepos, Att. 18; Cic. Orator, c. 34; Brut. 3, 4. The work is called 'Annalis,' by Cic. ad Att. xii. 23, and Nepos, Hannibal, 13. Atticus was learned in the historical antiquities of his country. Compare Blum, Einleitung, &c. p. 118. A view similar to that of Cicero is sometimes expressed by modern writers: thus, Mr. Long says of Sallust, that 'he has probably the merit of

---

being the first Roman who wrote what is usually called history.' Smith's Biogr. Dict. in v., while Becker, Vorarbeiten, &c. p. 200, says that Livy was the first historian of the Romans, properly so called. In like manner, it might be said that Hume was the first to write the history of England.

(102) Compare Horat. Ep. ii. i. 156-63.

(103) See De Orat. ii. 12-15; De Leg. i. 2, 3. Compare his character of Sisenna in Brut. 64. Hujus omnis facultas ex historiâ ipsius perspici potest; quæ cum facile omnes vincat superiores, tum indicat tamen quantum absit a summo, quamque genus hoc scriptionis nondum sit satis Latinis litteris illustratum. In Leg. i. 2, he says of the same Sisenna: 'Is tamen neque orator in numero vestro unquam est habitus, et in historiâ puerile quiddam consectatur; ut unum Clitarchum, neque præterea quemquam, de Græcis legisse videatur; cum tamen velle duntaxat imitari; quem si assequi posset, aliquantum ab optimo tamen abesset.' He here makes success in the higher style dependent on the imitation of the best Greek models. Clitarchus was a historian of Alexander the Great; his style is characterized by Longinus, de Sublim. c. 3, as inflated and empty. On the rhetorical character of the finished style of Roman history, see Ulrici, Ant. Hist. p. 111.

others.(104) The only historian prior to Livy, whom Velleius considers worthy of being named, is Cato: the rest he designates as 'ancient and obscure.'(105) Dionysius, in the introduction to his 'Roman Antiquities,' after stating that he passed twenty-two years at Rome, in order to collect materials for his book, and that he had learned the Latin language for this purpose, proceeds to say that he had read the most approved works of native writers, on their early history; of whom he specifies Fabius, Cato, Calpurnius Piso, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, Ælius Tubero, and Gellius. He characterizes the works of these historians by saying that they resembled the annals, or chronological summaries, of Greek history.(106) Quintilian, reviewing the literature of his country at the end of the first century after Christ, does not hesitate to regard Rome as equal to Greece in historical compositions; he opposes Sallust to Thucydides, and Livy to Herodotus: he does not, however, name any prior historian.(107)

But although the series of historical writers who have been enumerated, from Fabius and Cincius down to Sylla and Macer, were not distinguished for any literary or philosophical excellence—though they were not artists in history—yet they were trustworthy witnesses respecting the events of their own time. Regarded as contemporary chroniclers, they must be placed in the rank of memoir writers—and be estimated accordingly. They were, most of them, men conversant with public affairs—both civil and military—who had filled high offices—and sat in the Senate—who had, in some cases, been actors in the events which they narrated—and who, by their social position, had access to good information and enlightened opinions respecting the political events of their time.

---

(104) Cat. 8.

(105) Historicos (ut et Livium quoque priorum ætati adstruas), præter Catonem et quosdam veteres et obscuros, minus lxxx annis circumdatum ævum tulit; ut nec poetarum in antiquius citeriusve processit ubertas.—i. 17, § 2. The life of Velleius Paterculus extends from about 19 B.C. to 31 A.D. The period of eighty years mentioned by Velleius must be from about 50 B.C. to 30 A.D. As it excludes Livy, it must be probably meant likewise to exclude Sallust.

(106) i. 7. εἰσὶ δὲ ταῖς Ἑλληνικαῖς χρονογραφίαις ἐοικυῖαι.

(107) Inst. Orat. x. 1, § 101. Quintilian evidently considers Livy as inferior to Sallust. In § 102, he speaks of the 'immortalis illa velocitas' of Sallust; by which he appears to mean his pregnancy and concision of style, which carries the reader rapidly along.

It may be true, as Sallust remarks, that prior to his time the great men of Rome were exclusively occupied with action, and thought more of making history than writing it. Nevertheless, it is certain that Roman history, under the Republic, was written by men of the highest social position, who had been engaged in public life, and themselves filled some of the principal offices in the state. Most of the earlier historians were of consular or senatorial rank: and this custom continued after the Republic; for among the early emperors, Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, and Vespasian, composed historical writings.(108) It is particularly mentioned that L. Otacilius Pilitus, the master of Pompey, was the first freedman who wrote history at Rome; before him it had been written only by persons of free birth. However defective the literary cultivation of the high-born Romans of the Republic may have been, and however little they regarded the graces of style, they could not fail to write the history of their own time with the advantages of knowledge and personal experience.

The distinction between the veracious witness, and the eloquent or philosophical historian, is apparent in several of the passages which have been cited. Thus Sallust, who speaks of the absence of eminent historians at Rome, nevertheless praises the history of Sisenna as an account of the times of Sylla, and commends that of Fannius for its veracity. We know, likewise, that some of them were painstaking and laborious in the search after truth: that they were not guilty of the indolent readiness to accept the first account which presented itself, described and censured by Thucydides. Thus Cincius is described by Livy as being a diligent antiquarian, in relation to events prior to his own age :(109) and we may reasonably suppose that he was equally careful with respect to contemporaneous occurrences.

---

(108) See Ulrici, Ant. Hist., p. 108, where this remark is made. Respecting the autobiography of Augustus, see Suet. Oct. 85; Krause, De Suet. Font., p. 31.—Tiberius wrote a brief memoir of his own life, Suet. Tib. 61. Krause, ib. p. 51.—Claudius wrote a history in forty-three books, from the death of Julius Cæsar, and also a work in eight books, concerning his own life, Suet. Claud. 41. Krause, ib. p. 63. He had been exhorted when a young man, by Livy to write history.—Concerning Vespasian's Memoirs, see Josephus, De Vita sua, § 65; Egger, Examen des Hist. d'Auguste, p. 183.—Domitian entirely neglected history; his entire historical reading was limited to the memoir of Tiberius. Suet. Domit. 20.

§ 9 Most of the voluminous Roman historians began their works from a remote period, generally from the foundation of the city.(110) They rejoiced in tracing all their characteristic institutions and customs, civil and religious—their temples and other public buildings, to some celebrated founder, near the supposed beginning of the state. But, what Dionysius says of Fabius and Cincius is probably true of most of them—they were concise in the early periods, and full in the times of which they had personal experience. Their main purpose was to write recent and contemporary history. Even Livy, whom on account of the accidental preservation of the early books, and the loss of the later books of his history, we are accustomed to consider as an antiquarian compiler, was in truth regarded in quite a different light, when his entire work was extant.(111) The principal object of Livy was to relate the events of the period immediately preceding his own life, and partly contemporary with it. The books of his history beginning with 103 and extending to 142, being nearly a third part of the entire work, were coincident with his own lifetime.(112) In his proem, he supposes his readers to be more solicitous to read the history of the civil wars, than to dwell on the early period.(113) Augustus likewise considered him mainly in the light of a contemporary historian, when he called him a Pompeian.(114)

---

(109) vii. 3.

(110) Q. Fufius Calenus, in his speech against Cicero in Dio Cassius, makes it a reproach to him that having undertaken to write Roman history, he had not, *like all the other historians*, begun with the foundation of the city, but had limited himself to his own consulship.—xlvi. 21.

(111) Blum, Einleitung, &c. p. 123, remarks that the principal attention of the Romans was directed to the present, not to their early history.

(112) Livy was born in 59 B.C., and died, in 17 A.D., at the age of seventy-six. Cæsar's first campaign in Gaul, of the year 58 B.C., was described in book 103.

(113) Et legentium plerisque haud dubito quin primæ origines proximaque originibus minus præbitura voluptatis sint, festinantibus ad hæc nova, quibus jam pridem prævalentis populi vires se ipsæ conficiunt. Præf.

That this was the true character of Livy's work will appear more clearly from an analysis of its contents. The first book contains the entire regal period of 244 years; the nine following books, the events from the beginning of the Republic to the latter part of the Samnite wars, a period of 217 years. The ten following books (which are lost) included the history of seventy-two years, and the twenty-five next, (which have been preserved(115) the history of fifty-one years. Here ends the extant portion of the work. The period of ninety years, from 166 B.C. after the termination of the war with Perseus to the death of Sylla in 76 B.C., occupied the next forty-five books. The thirty-three years from the death of Sylla to that of Cæsar (44 B.C.) were contained in the next twenty-six books, and the thirty-four years from the death of Cæsar to that of Drusus (9 B.C.) in the remaining twenty-six books. Including the period of the kings, the first decad has an average of forty-six years to each book. Excluding the royal period, there is an average of 29¾ years for books 2—4, from the beginning of the Republic to the capture of the city by the Gauls; and an average of 19⅕ years for books 6—10 from the same epoch to the end of the Samnite wars. For the ten books, from 291 to 219 B.C., including the war with Pyrrhus, the First Punic War, and the Gallic war, there is an average of 7⅕ years to each book.(116) For the twenty-five books,

---

(114) Titus Livius, eloquentiæ ac fidei præclarus in primis, Cn. Pompeium tantis laudibus tulit, ut Pompeianum eum Augustus appellaret; neque id amicitiæ eorum offecit. Tacit. Ann. iv. 34, where 'fidei' refers to the trustworthiness of Livy as a historical witness. Livy likewise said in his history, that it was doubtful whether it was better for the commonwealth that Julius Cæsar should have been born, or not born. Sen. Nat. Quæst. v. 18, § 3. Becker, Vorarbeiten zu einer Geschichte des zweiten Punischen Krieges, (Altona, 1823,) p. 206, remarks, that Livy's main object was the history of the period from the fall of the Gracchi to Augustus. He thinks, moreover, that the first decads were the production of Livy's youth, while the last decads were the fruit of his mature age, ib. p. 207; also that on account of the bulk of the work, few persons could afford to procure the whole of it, and that the majority of Romans probably only possessed and read the part containing the history of the last century of the Republic.

(115) The last five books are not quite complete.

(116) For the first five books, the average is 5⅕ years; for the last five books it is 9 years. The contents are as follows:—

218 to 167 B.C. including the Second Punic War, and the wars with Philip, Antiochus, and Perseus, there is an average of about two years to each book; as well as for the forty-five books from 166 to 76 B.C., the death of Sylla. For the fifty-two books from 77 to 9 B.C. there is an average of 15⅔ months to each book.

It will be observed, therefore, that the scale of composition goes on steadily increasing in copiousness as the work advances. The first book disposes of at least 244 years,(117) and for the first 217 years of the Republic, the average contents of a book are twenty-four years. At the period of the first Punic war, the scale is about seven years to a book, while the last fifty books each contain on an average less than 1½ years. The entire period of 152 years, from 218 to 76 B.C., from the beginning of the Second Punic War to the death of Sylla, included in eighty books, averaged just two years to a book. But the two periods from the death of Sylla to that of Cæsar, and from the death of Cæsar to that of Drusus, of thirty-three and thirty-four years respectively, were each contained in twenty-six books.(118)

	B.C.	
B. 11—15	291—265	= 26 years.
B. 16—20	264—219	= 45 years.

The First Punic War is therefore narrated on a more contracted scale than the preceding wars with Pyrrhus and the Gauls. This is the only exception to the generally progressive scale of Livy's work.

(117) The first book in fact deduces the history of Rome from Æneas, through the Alban series of kings. Assuming the ordinary date for the capture of Troy, 1184 B.C., the first book would contain the history of 674 years, if we include the præ-Roman period.

(118) Livy's history was contained in 142 books, as is proved by the authentic epitomes now extant. Two only, namely, the epitomes for books 136 and 137, including the events of nine years from 25 to 15 B.C., have been lost. See Sigonius and Drakenborch, ad loc. and Fabric. Bibl. Lat. vol. i. p. 278. This hiatus is recognised by the codex Nazarianus, preserved at Heidelberg, on which the recent edition of Jahn (Lips. 1853) is founded. See p. xiii. and 107. The epitomes of Livy have been attributed to Florus, Fabric. ib. p. 290; but for this belief there is no sufficient ground. Niebuhr remarks in his History, that 'the author of these epitomes was nearly contemporary with Livy, and well acquainted with the ancient relations.'—vol. iii. n. 932. In his Lectures, however, vol. i. p. lxxii. he regards them as less ancient. See Jahn, ib. p. viii. The accuracy with which these epitomes were executed may be tested by a comparison with the 35 extant books. The comparative brevity of the epitomes of the last books is attributed by Jahn, ib. p. xiii, to the impatience of their author to arrive at the end of his work. It may however

Livy, at the beginning of book xxxi, himself remarks that the magnitude of his work increases, as he descends to a lower period of time. He observes that sixty-three years, from the beginning of the first to the end of the Second Punic War, (264—201 B.C.) have occupied as many books of his history as 488 years from the building of the city to the consulship of Appius Claudius (264 B.C.) In other words, books i—xv. included 488 years; whereas books xvi—xxx included only sixty-three years.(119)

§ 10 Besides the histories and historical memoirs, composed by native contemporary writers, which extended in a continuous series from the first or certainly the Second Punic War, to the times of Cæsar and Cicero, there were also extant in antiquity numerous orations of Roman statesmen on subjects of public interest, for a still longer period. The earliest speech which appears to have been preserved, is that of Appius the Blind,

---

be in part owing to their greater copiousness of detail, and to the smaller number of leading facts in each. The books of Livy were his own divisions. Thus at the beginning of b. vi, he speaks of the previous history having occupied five books: 'quinque libris exposui,' vi. 1. In the tenth book, he speaks of the Samnite wars reaching into a fourth book; that is, from b. vii. to b. x. 'Supersunt etiam nunc Samnitium bella, quæ continua per quartum jam volumen—agimus,' x. 31. At the beginning of b. xxxi, he likewise compares the unequal periods of time occupied by equal numbers of his books (volumina). The practice of dividing histories into a series of numbered books seems to have originated with Timæus, or some other writer of the 3rd century B.C. See Class. Mus. vol. ii. p. 40. The books of the early Roman historians were probably their own divisions. Cicero, who was anterior to Livy, frequently mentions the books of his own writings; see, for example, de Div. ii. 1.

(119) Dr. Arnold justly points out the great value of the later portion of Livy's work, which is unhappily lost. 'We might cheerfully resign not the second decade only, but the first, third, and fourth; in short, every line of Livy's history which we at present possess, if we could so purchase the recovery of the eighth and ninth decades, which contained the history of the Italian war, and of the Civil war of Marius and Sylla, which followed it. For this period, of which we know, as it is, so little, Livy's history would have been invaluable. He would have been writing of times and events sufficiently near to his own, to have been perfectly understood by him, his sources of information would have been more numerous and less doubtful; and then his fair and upright mind, and the beauty of his narrative, would have given us a picture at once faithful, lively, and noble.'—vol. ii. p. 360. Ruperti, Prooem. de Liv. vit. et hist. sect. 4, (prefixed to his edition of Livy), expresses his opinion that the excellencies of Livy shone forth with the greatest lustre in the last 97 books, including the history of the years 586—744 U.C. On the later portion of Livy's work, see Egger, Hist. d'Aug. p. 98—101.

delivered in the Senate on the occasion of the embassy from Pyrrhus, in 280 B.C.(120) There was also extant an eulogy pronounced by Fabius Maximus on his son, after the year 213 B.C.(121) Cicero had read one hundred and fifty speeches of Cato the censor,(122) and the subjects of ninety-three of these can be still ascertained.(123) A long list of orations, accessible to a Roman writer at the close of the Republic, or under the Empire,(124) has been compiled by modern critics;(125) and many, of which all memory is now lost, were then doubtless extant. The names of the chief orators are recounted by Cicero in the historical sketch of Roman oratory, which he introduces in his dialogue of Brutus,(126) and which proves that numerous speeches from the time of the Punic wars downwards had been preserved in an authentic form. These speeches, like those delivered by the Greek orators, were doubtless reduced into writing, and published by the speakers themselves after their delivery.(127) It was not until the time of Cicero and Cæsar that the practice of reporting speeches by means of short-hand writers was introduced. M. Cornelius Cethegus, who died in 196 B.C., after the end of the Second Punic War, is considered by Cicero as the earliest Roman who was distinguished for his eloquence.(128)

---

(120) Cic. Brut. 16; De Sen. 6; Meyer, Orat. Rom. Fragm. p. 1—3; Klotz, Lat. Litteraturgeschichte, p. 349; Egger, Lat. Serm. Vet. Rel. p. 101. Compare Isidorus Orig. i. 37. Primus apud Græcos Pherecydes Syrus solutâ oratione scripsit; apud Romanos autem Appius Cæcus adversus Pyrrhum solutam orationem primus exercuit. Jam exhinc et ceteri prosam orationem condiderunt.

(121) Meyer, ib. p. 4.

(122) Brut. 17.

(123) Meyer, ib. p. 19—143. Comp. Bernhardy, p. 583.

(124) Livy, xxxix. 43, censures Valerius Antias for not having read a speech of Cato delivered in 184 B.C., and for having followed an unauthenticated rumour—'fabulæ tantum sine auctore editæ.' See Meyer, ib. p. 57.

(125) See the list of orations collected by Meyer for the period of the Republic.

(126) c. 14 sq.

(127) Pleræque enim scribuntur orationes habitæ jam, non ut habeantur. Cic. Brut. 24.

(128) Brut. 15. Compare Ellendt, Eloquentiæ Romanæ Historia, prefixed to his edition of the Brutus, 1844. It may be observed that Plutarch's collection of the sayings of kings and generals begins, in the Roman section, with M'. Curius Dentatus, C. Fabricius, and Fabius Maximus, all of whom are posterior to the time of Pyrrhus.

The age of Cicero and Livy likewise possessed an official contemporaneous register, including the names of the principal annual magistrates, and of some other public occurrences, which may be safely assumed to have reached back, in an uninterrupted succession, as far as the First or Second Punic War. How much further it may have extended, is a question which will require examination lower down. Various public monuments and documents were also in existence at the same time, such as records of laws, and other public acts. How far back this series may have extended, is uncertain: but there are even now extant inscriptions of a comparatively early date. Thus the Duilian inscription on the Columna rostrata refers to the year 260 B.C.:(129) the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus, to the year 186 B.C., the Lex Thoria, to the year 111 B.C. From these examples, as well as from the accounts of the Roman archives, (of which more will be said hereafter,) (130) we may infer that the laws of the period in question were preserved in antiquity.

§ 11. Looking back to the preceding description of the sources of information respecting the annals of his own country, which were open to a Roman writer, at the end of the Republic, or in the early part of the Empire, we may affirm with safety that the materials for an authentic history based on contemporary documents and testimony, were then as ample for the period from the First Punic War as for the history of any modern European state during any equal period antecedent to the invention of printing. This great invention has entirely altered the conditions for the composition of history; inasmuch as its use preserves many documents which would otherwise have perished, or perhaps have not ever existed. It would be vain to expect that the sources of Roman history during the civil wars of Rome should ever have been as copious as the sources of French history during the wars of the League and the Fronde, as the sources of German history during the Thirty years' war, or as the sources of English history during the war between Charles the First and his Parliament. When, therefore, Cicero speaks of the entire absence of history from the Roman literature of his time, and when Sallust laments that the great deeds of the Romans had been celebrated by no annalist worthy of their importance, they must be understood to speak as rhetoricians, and perhaps as philosophers, but not as historians. The historical writings of their countrymen then in existence were not, it is true, works of art, to be compared with the Greek masterpieces. There was no Thucydides, or Polybius, not even a Herodotus or a Xenophon, among the Roman historical writers before Cicero. But there were historians, in the sense of authentic registrars and recorders of contemporary events; grave and dignified writers, who, at a time when there were no newspapers, and no Annual Registers, had collected accurate accounts of the public events of their own and the immediately preceding ages, and had digested them in a plain and connected, though perhaps dry, unadorned, and unpretending narrative. The extant Memoirs of Cæsar, though doubtless the product of a more vigorous mind, and composed with greater elegance and perspicuity of style, may doubtless serve to give us an idea of the contemporary chronicles, which Cicero criticized with so much scornful severity, but which we would gladly possess as valuable materials for the composition of Roman history.

---

(129) See Klotz, ib. p. 306.

(130) ch. 5, § 3.

Nor was it merely in the absence of an eloquent and attractive style, that these early historical works of the Romans were deficient. They were for the most part written in a stiff annalistic method, and hence are likened by Dionysius to the Greek chronological compendia. In general, they did not trace the connexion and filiation of events; Sempronius Asellio, who considers the deduction of causes as necessary to a history,(131) appears to mark his own practice as different from that of his predecessors. These historians, moreover, seem to have imitated the practice of their state annals,(132) in recording prodigies and other occurrences deemed supernatural, or indicative of the displeasure of the gods, or examples of their direct interference with human affairs. Livy has retained this practice, though probably rather because his predecessors had used it, than because he attached much importance to prodigies.(133) The character which we observe in Livy, with respect to the mention of omens, prodigies, dreams, and other divine communications, was doubtless much more strongly marked in the earlier Roman authors of history; and it must have formed a strong contrast with the reserved and somewhat contemptuous manner in which these subjects are treated by Thucydides, and still more strongly with the disbelief which Polybius expresses for the popular religion. The religious spirit of the Romans, with which Polybius(134) was so much struck, and which he so little shared—whatever might be its effects in promoting a faithful observance of oaths and promises, doubtless produced much credulity in the reception of false prodigies, such as the speaking of sheep and cattle; and much superstitious fear of natural though rare events, such as monstrous births, eclipses, meteors, inundations, and earthquakes. These prodigies were, during the republican period, treated as subjects of public concern, for the expiation of which the state took proper measures, and appointed proper ceremonies; and hence they naturally attracted the attention of the native annalist. The absence of a philosophical spirit in the early Roman historians would therefore strike Cicero, or any other person of his time imbued with the Hellenic cultivation, both as regards the deduction of causes, and the explanation of events, and also the importance attached to the manifestations of popular superstition.

---

(131) Ap. Gell. v. 18.

(132) See Cato, ap. Gell. ii. 28.

---

(133) See, in xliii. 13, his curious apology for reciting prodigies, combined with the statement that in his time the reporting of prodigies by the local authorities to the government, and their registration in the public annals, had ceased. Concerning Livy's treatment of prodigies, see Lachmann de Font. Liv. i. p. 79, ii. p. 65. It should be remarked however, that Dio Cassius, in his history of the later years of the Republic, recounts the prodigies not less carefully or fully than Livy. It is therefore evident that they continued to be noted down at this time.

(134) See vi. 56. Compare iii. 47-8, where Polybius ridicules the story told by former historians of a divine being who appeared to Hannibal in crossing the Alps, and showed him the way. To introduce such supernatural incidents into a narrative of facts is, says Polybius, to violate the very essence of history.

Livy, who was born only forty-seven years after Cicero, is so far from sharing his views as to the historical literature of Rome being a blank, that, in the preface to his history, he alludes particularly to the large number of his predecessors, and he consoles himself for the possible failure of his work, by the reflection that those whose histories will be read in preference to his own are eminent and distinguished writers.(135) At a somewhat later time, indeed, when the freedom of historical composition had been restricted by the censorship of the Emperors, the closing period of the Republic seems to have been regarded as the golden age of Roman historiography. Thus Seneca, the rhetorician, who was born about 60 B.C., in alluding to the burning of the historical work of Labienus, which appears to have taken place in the later years of Augustus, considers it a happy circumstance that this mode of suppressing the thoughts of great writers was not employed until the great writers had ceased to exist.(136)

A similar view is taken by Tacitus. 'Many historians (he says) have related the first 720 years after the building of the city, during which time the affairs of the Roman people were described with equal eloquence and freedom of speech. After the battle of Actium, when the entire power was, for the maintenance of peace, surrendered to one man, these great writers ceased, and at the same time the truth of history was infringed, partly from ignorance of public affairs, partly from flattery, or hatred of the Emperor.'(137) In speaking of the 'great historians' of this period Tacitus must have had Sallust principally in his mind, who died in 34 B.C., three years before the battle of Actium, and on whose writings Tacitus had formed his own style. Livy was only twenty-eight years old at the time of this battle, and survived it forty-eight years. His history was doubtless not published until he had reached a mature age.

---

(135) Facturusne operæ pretium sim, si a primordio urbis res populi Romani perscripserim, nec satis scio: nec, si sciam, dicere ausim: quippe qui *quum veterem tum vulgatam esse rem* videam, dum *novi semper scriptores* aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se, aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt. Utcunque erit, juvabit tamen, rerum gestarum memoriæ principis terrarum populi pro virili parte et me ipsum consuluisse; et si *in tantâ scriptorum turbâ* mea fama in obscuro sit, *nobilitate et magnitudine eorum*, meo qui nomini officient me consoler. Præf. The treatise de Oratore was written in 55 B.C.; the Brutus in 46 B.C. Livy was born in 59 B.C.

(136) Dii melius quod eo seculo ista ingeniorum supplicia cœperunt, quo et ingenia desierunt. Sen. Controv. lib. v. præf. p. 330 ed. Bipont. It appears from the context that Seneca has Cicero chiefly in mind when he speaks of the great 'ingenia' of the previous generation. Concerning the burning of the history of Cremutius Cordus, under Tiberius, see Dio Cass. lvii. 24; Tac. Ann. iv. 34-5. Another book by Fab. Veiento, containing abuse of persons in high stations, was burnt under Nero, Tac. Ann. xiv. 50.

If the histories of these annalistic writers were now extant, they certainly would at least stand a comparison with the best of the medieval chronicles, and probably would not be inferior to the Hellenics of Xenophon. But whatever their literary merit may have been, they served as a solid basis for the histories which Livy and other later writers framed from them for the two last centuries of the Republic, and upon which the accounts for this period now extant were founded.

---

(137) Hist. i. 1, *octingentos*, the reading of the manuscripts, is clearly an error; the sense requires *septingentos*. A similar passage occurs at the beginning of the Annals: 'Sed veteris populi Romani prospera vel adversa *claris scriptoribus* memorata sunt, temporibusque Augusti dicendis non defuere decora ingenia, donec gliscente adulatione deterrerentur. Tiberii Caiique et Claudii ac Neronis res, florentibus ipsis, ob metum falsæ; postquam occiderant, recentibus odiis compositæ sunt.' Pliny the younger, says of Pliny the elder 'Dubii sermonis octo scripsit (libros) sub Nerone novissimis annis, cum omne studiorum genus paulo liberius et erectius periculosum servitus fecisset,'—Epist. iii. 5. Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1, p. xlvii., says, 'Owing to the great change in the Roman world under Augustus, the history of the Roman Republic was closed, like the temple of Janus.' Dio Cassius says that under the free Commonwealth there was the utmost publicity of the affairs of state; that they came before the senate and people, even those which passed at a distance; and thus all knew them, and many wrote their history. In this way, he adds, by the mutual corrections of different authors, and by a comparison with public records, the truth was ascertained. Under the Empire, however, almost everything became secret; few histories were written, and those which were published, were received with distrust, because other writers did not dare to criticize or contradict them. liii. 19. Egger, however, Examen des Hist. anc. d'Auguste, p. 288-9, thinks that the complaints of Dio Cassius respecting the deficiency of original materials for the history of the Empire, are exaggerated. Tacitus, Ann. iv. 32, considers the history of the old Republic, with its victorious wars, and its intestine commotions, as a more interesting and elevated theme than that of the Empire. 'Nobis (he says) in arcto et inglorius labor.'

§ 12 Besides the prose-writers who had preserved the history from the First Punic War to the close of the Republic, there were likewise two poets who must be here mentioned. Ennius,(138) the father of Latin hexameter song, who was born in 239 and died in 169 B.C., wrote eighteen books of *Annales* in hexameter verse.(139) He began his metrical chronicle with the story of Romulus and Remus, and brought down the narrative to his own age. But instead of dwelling on the mythical centuries, he, like the prose annalists, treated this period with comparative conciseness, and devoted the chief part of his poem to the wars of his own lifetime. He touched, indeed, but briefly on the First Punic War, because this subject had been already occupied by Nævius;(140) but the disproportion between the scale of his treatment for the early and later times was so great, that (assuming the distribution of his fragments into books by his last editor to be an approximation to the truth) it would follow that his first seven books included not less than 524 years; while the last eleven books included only fifty-seven years, the whole of which latter period was comprehended within his lifetime. According to the same arrangement, the first seven books contained on an average about seventy-six years; while the last eleven books contained about five years, and the last eight books only three years each.(141) The historical epic of Ennius was not without imitators; for L. Accius, or Attius, who is stated to have been born in 170 B.C., the year before the death of that poet, and who lived to such an age that Cicero, when a young man, had conversed with him,(142) besides some tragedies, wrote a poem entitled *Annales*, containing the history of his country; doubtless after the example of Ennius. Six rude hexameter verses are cited from it by Macrobius, in which the festival of the Saturnalia, and the custom of the slaves to feast at it with their masters, are traced to a Greek origin.(143) The Istrian war of 176 B.C. was also celebrated by Hostius in a hexameter poem, containing at least two books; he probably lived at or near the time.(144)

---

(138) See Enn. Annal. Fragm. ed. Spangenberg, Lips. 1825. There is an earlier edition by Hesselius, Amstelod. 1707.

(139) The passage of Suet. de ill. Gramm. c. 2, merely states that Varganteius made the Annals of Ennius known, by reciting them on a fixed day to a large assembly. It does not state that they were divided into books by Varganteius, as is assumed by Spangenberg, ib. p. xxii. 174. See Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1, p. xxxii. n. 10. The annals of Ennius were doubtless divided by himself into books, and the statement of Varro, in Gell. xvii. 21, is to be understood literally. The practise of dividing poems into books had arisen before his time: Classical Museum, vol. ii. p. 35.

(140) Cic. Brut. 19. Compare Spangenberg, p. 88. The following verses of Propertius indicate some of the subjects included in the Annals of Ennius:

> Parvaque tam magnis admoram fontibus ora
>   Unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit,
> Et cecinit Curios fratres et Horatia pila,
>   Regiaque Æmiliâ vecta tropæa rate;
> Victricesque moras Fabii, pugnamq. sinistram
>   Cannensem, et versos ad pia vota Deos;
> Hannibalemque Lares Romanâ sede fugantes,
>   Anseris et tutum voce fuisse Jovem.—iv. 3, v. 5—12.

The events here alluded to are, 1, The battle of the Horatii and Curiatii. 2, The capture of Rome by the Gauls. 3, The Second Punic War. 4, A triumph of L. Æmilius Regillus over an admiral of Antiochus in 189 B.C. Livy, xxxvii. 58. See Spangenberg, p. 159. This seems more probable than the defeat of Demetrius, governor of the Island of Pharos, in the Adriatic, by L. Æmilius Paulus, the consul, in 219 B.C., to which Mr. Paley refers the verse of Propertius.

Although Ennius was the earliest Roman who wrote in hexameter verse, he was not the earliest historical poet of his country. Nævius was born about 274—264 B.C.; he served in the First Punic War; as to the time of his death, there was in antiquity a doubt between the years 204 and 202 B.C. He composed in his old age, and therefore about 210 B.C., a poem in Saturnian verse, on the First Punic War; the whole of which doubtless fell within his lifetime. In the early part of this poem there appear to have been allusions to the story of Æneas and Dido, as connected with the relations of Rome and Carthage.(145) The seventeenth year of the war, when the Romans were in quiet occupation of Sicily, is particularly mentioned in a fragment cited from the sixth book of this poem.(146)

---

(141) See Spangenberg's edition, whose arrangement rests in part on very uncertain conjectures. Cicero Brut. 15, states that the consulship of M. Cornelius Cethegus and P. Sempronius Tuditanus (204 B.C.) was mentioned in the ninth book. Compare Spangenberg, p. 130. Ennius was brought to Rome in this year by Cato, and heard the eloquence of Cethegus. If therefore the Annales of Ennius included the period from 753 to 173 B.C., it would follow from this testimony that the first eight books included 549 years, and the last ten books included thirty-one years. The words 'Leucatem campsant,' quoted from the tenth book by Priscian, appear to refer to the operations at Leucadia by L. Quinctius, in 197 B.C. (Livy, xxxiii. 17. Spangenberg, p. 141.) A passage relating to Antiochus and Hannibal is cited by Gellius, vii. 2, from the thirteenth book. (ib. p. 150.) According to Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1, p. xxxii., the first three books concluded the regal period: the fourth book contained the next 225 years; the war of Pyrrhus occupied the fifth book; the Second Punic War extended over books 7—12; in the thirteenth he treated of the war with Antiochus, and in the fifteenth the Istrian war; so that the last six books comprised a period of only twenty-four years.

(142) Brut. 28.

(143) Macrob. Saturn. i. 7. The few fragments of his Annales are collected in Krause. ib. p. 176. The doubts of Bernhardy, Grundriss, p. 368, n. 317, respecting this work seem unfounded.

(144) See Weichert, Poetarum Latinorum Reliquiæ, p. 13.

Both Nævius and Ennius, although poets, may be considered as historical witnesses. The historical poem of Nævius was wholly contemporary; that of Ennius had the same character to a considerable extent, inasmuch as eleven out of eighteen books described the events of his own life. How far they may have studied historical accuracy, the loss of their works prevents us from determining; but the epical and narrative form of their compositions probably led to their adhering more to plain matter-of-fact than Æschylus in his drama of 'The Persians,' and Phrynichus in his 'Capture of Miletus.' Yet the description of the battle of Salamis, by Æschylus, has been followed by modern historians, and the well-known anecdote in Herodotus proves that the Athenians considered the drama of Phrynichus to be a truthful representation of real facts.(147)

§ 13 In ascending the stream of Roman history, we are deserted by all known contemporary testimony of native historians, either in poetry or prose, as soon as we have passed the commencement of the First Punic War. Even for that war the only strictly coeval testimony is that of the poet Nævius. Fabius and Cincius, though they may have been both born before its termination and lived with the generation who were actors in it, were not contemporary observers of its progress.(148)

---

(145) See Nævius, ed. Klussmann, (Jena, 1853,) in the fragments of the two first books. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 191.

(146) See Klussmann, p. 73. Concerning Nævius, see Krause, p. 34; Niebuhr, ib. p. xxiii. The poem of Nævius was originally written in a continuous tenor, but it was subsequently divided by C. Octavius Lampadio into seven books: Sueton. de ill. Gramm. c. 2.

(147) Herod., vi. 21. As to the inaccuracy of poets on contemporary facts, see Egger, Hist. anc. d'Auguste, p. 114.

A short time, however, before the First Punic War, an event had occurred, which for the first time brought the Romans into direct conflict with their more civilized and literary neighbours, the Greeks. In the year 281 B.C., seventeen years before the beginning of that war, Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, had landed with an army at Tarentum, for the purpose of assisting the people of that city in hostilities against the Romans. The war thus adopted by Pyrrhus, and subsequently diverted by him to Sicily, was terminated in 274 B.C., by his defeat, and his final departure from Italy.

The year after Pyrrhus left Italy (273 B.C.), Ptolemy Philadelphus, seeing the issue of this expedition, sent an embassy to Rome, in order to cultivate the amity of the Roman people. The embassy was favourably received by the Romans, who sent a mission in return, which was treated with much distinction by the Greek king of Egypt.(149) This diplomatic intercourse proves that the success of the Romans against Pyrrhus, and their military power, were facts well known at the time in Greece. Some years afterwards, the Carthaginians, during the First Punic War, sent an embassy to Ptolemy Philadelphus, to borrow 2,000 talents of him. The king, seeing that he had alliances of amity both with the Romans and the Carthaginians, endeavoured to reconcile them together; but, failing in the attempt, he declined to interfere in the contest, saying that he ought to assist friends against enemies, not against friends.(150) The subsisting alliance with the Romans, to which reference was then made, is that of

---

(148) Dr. Arnold remarks that in the fourth and fifth centuries the Romans had as yet no contemporary historians. Hist. of Rome, vol. ii. p. 446, 670.

(149) Liv. Epit. 14; Eutrop. 11, 15; Dio. Cass. Fragm. 41, ed. Bekker; Zon. viii. 6; Val. Max. iv. 3, § 9. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 548.

(150) Appian, H. R. v. 1. Schweighæuser, vol. iii. p. 188, refers this embassy to the year of Cotta and Servilius, 248 B.C. Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus) reigned from 283 to 247 B.C.

273 B.C. The power of the Romans was likewise known to Demetrius Poliorcetes, who died in 283 B.C. This prince sent an objurgatory message to the Romans, alleging that they, who were the military masters of Italy, ought not to allow the inhabitants of Antium to practise piracy with the Etruscans.(151)

The unsuccessful expedition of Archidamus III., king of Sparta, in 338 B.C., to assist the Tarentines in a war with the Lucanians, did not affect the interests of Rome; nor did the more important operations of Alexander of Epirus, in Southern Italy, at a later date, produce any other consequence with regard to Rome than a barren treaty, entered into after a descent made by him near Pæstum, and a victory gained there over the Samnites and Lucanians.(152) He had come into Italy at the invitation of the Tarentines, and had gained important successes in the South; but was killed in the Bruttian territory, in a war to which the Romans were not a party.(153) If indeed an anecdote reported by Gellius is to be trusted, he came into Italy with the intention of making war upon the Romans:(154) but there is no proof that he entertained any such design. The subsequent expedition of Cleonymus the Lacedæmonian, in 302 B.C., is stated by Diodorus to have been partly directed against the Romans,(155) and Livy represents him as having been driven away by a Roman army.(156)

§ 14 Now although the Romans, at the time of the war with Pyrrhus, had no literature, either in prose or verse, and therefore no historians, the Greeks had for more than two centuries been a literary people; and were already in possession of a continuous series of histories, composed by contemporary writers, ascending to at least the commencement of this period. The birth of Herodotus was just two centuries before the landing of Pyrrhus in Italy. Thucydides, Philistus, Ephorus, Xenophon, Theopompus, and many others, had before this time written Greek history. As soon, therefore, as the affairs of Rome became involved with the affairs of Greece, they would naturally be noticed by the contemporary Greek writers, and be included in their historical works.(157) Before the war of Pyrrhus, no events had occurred in connexion with Rome, which required more than an incidental mention of this rising city, in the writings of Greek historians; such, for instance, as the message of Demetrius, or the expeditions of Alexander the Molossian and Cleonymus. At the time of the capture of Rome by the Gauls, the inhabitants of Greece Proper seem to have been ignorant of the existence of such a city,(158) and the news of this formidable irruption found its way but slowly to Athens. Heraclides of Pontus, in a treatise concerning the soul, mentioned a rumour from the west that an army coming out from the Hyperboreans, had taken a Greek city called Rome, situated somewhere in those regions, near the Great Sea.(159) Aristotle however had heard an accurate account of the capture of Rome by the Celts, and he attributed the preservation of the Romans to a certain Lucius.(160) The birth of Aristotle did not take place till six years after this event; and the work in which he mentioned this fact (perhaps one of his collection of Constitutions), was probably not composed till he was forty or fifty years of age. Heraclides was the disciple of both Plato and Speusippus, and finally of Aristotle, and could scarcely have been many years senior to his last master. Theopompus, who was a few years younger than Aristotle, likewise incidentally mentioned the capture of Rome by the Gauls in one of his histories of Grecian affairs.(161)

---

(151) Strab. v. 3, § 5. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 423.

(152) Livy, viii. 17. This treaty may be placed about 333 B.C.

(153) Livy, viii. 24.

(154) Alter autem Alexander, cui cognomen tum Molosso fuit, in Italiam venit, bellum populo Romano facturus; jam enim fama virtusque felicitatisque Romanæ apud exteras gentes enitescere incœptabat, sed, prius quam bellum faceret, vitâ decessit. Gell. xvii. 21, § 33. The saying which Gellius proceeds to put into the mouth of Alexander of Epirus, that the Asiatics with whom his nephew Alexander had to contend were women, whereas the Romans were men—is differently applied by Livy, ix. 19. He represents it as spoken by Alexander of Epirus, when he was mortally wounded in Lower Italy.

(155) Diod. xx. 104.

(156) x. 2.

---

(157) That the Greeks conceived their history in the form of a continuous narrative, is proved (if any proof be wanting) by their habit of tacking one history to another, of beginning one history where another ended. Thus Xenophon and also Theopompus in their Hellenica, continued Thucydides. Polybius continued Timæus; Posidonius continued Polybius. Diodorus brought down his history to the year in which that of Polybius ended. Concerning the Athenian historiography, see Bernhardy, Gr. Lit. vol. i. p. 333-340.

(158) Josephus, pointing out the narrow horizon of the geographical knowledge of the Greeks in early times, remarks that neither Herodotus, nor Thucydides, nor any of their contemporaries, ever mentioned the Romans; and that it was only at a late period, and with difficulty, that the Greeks became acquainted with them. Contr. Apion, i. § 12.

(159) Plut. Camill. 22. By the 'Great Sea,' is probably meant the Atlantic Ocean, so far as it has any distinct meaning. Heraclides evidently did not know that Rome was in Italy. Concerning the age of Heraclides, see Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. iii. p. 469, who discredits the statement of Suidas, that Heraclides took charge of Plato's school during his visits to

According to Pliny, Clitarchus, a contemporary historian, recorded the fact of an embassy having been sent by the Romans to Alexander the Great.(162) Arrian mentions that congratulatory embassies from various distant nations came to salute Alexander at Babylon, after his great expedition to India; and he names not only the Libyans, the Carthaginians, the Æthiopians, the Scythians of Europe, the Celts, and the Iberians, but also the Bruttians, the Lucanians, and the Etruscans from Italy. He then adds, that Aristus and Asclepiades, two of the historians of Alexander, include the Romans in the number; and state that when Alexander received the several embassies, he noticed the orderly and industrious qualities of the Romans, and their free

---

Sicily, and makes his life reach from about 372 to 307 B.C. According to this supposition, he was younger than Aristotle; which seems contrary to the meaning of Plutarch. C. Müller, Hist. Gr. Fragm. vol. ii. p. 197, likewise places him after Aristotle.

(160) Plut. ib. A work entitled *νόμιμα Ῥωμαίων*, distinct from the *νομίμων βαρβαρικῶν συναγωγή*. is included in the list of Aristotle's works, in the anonymous life in Buhle's edition, vol. i. p. 66, or in Westermann's Biogr. Græc. p. 404. Compare Hist. Gr. Fragm. vol. ii. p. 178. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 1257, thinks that Aristotle was not acquainted with the Roman constitution. Becker, Handbuch, vol. i. p. 37, does not believe that Rome was mentioned in the *πολιτεῖαι* of Aristotle. As to the person signified by Aristotle under the name *Lucius*, see below, ch. xii.

(161) Plin. N. H. iii. 9. Theopompus was born about 378, and died soon after 305 B.C.

(162) Plin. N. H. iii. 9. This testimony is accepted by Mommsen, R. G. vol. i. p. 253.

spirit; that he likewise made some inquiries concerning their constitution, and that he ended by predicting their future greatness. 'I repeat this statement' (says Arrian) 'neither as being certain, nor as altogether unworthy of belief. It is, however, to be noted that no Roman writer has mentioned the embassy to Alexander, nor is it alluded to by Ptolemy and Aristobulus, whom I regard as the best authorities; nor is it likely that the Romans, whose constitution was then very free, should send an embassy to a king of a foreign race, at so great a distance from their country, without any inducement of fear or hope, and when they regarded everything royal with abhorrence.' (163) It is to be observed that Arrian makes no allusion to the testimony of Clitarchus, adduced by Plutarch; Aristus of Salamis, whom he names, is described by Strabo as a late writer;(164) and the same was doubtless the case with Asclepiades. The embassies of several nations on the shores of the Mediterranean are likewise enumerated by Diodorus; but he makes no allusion to the Romans.(165) Clitarchus, though contemporary with Alexander, did not accompany his expedition, and he introduced many fabulous stories into his work; in his time, however, the mention of the Romans could have had no interest for his readers.(166) The silence of the best-informed Greek historians, and of all the Roman writers, certainly raises a presumption against the truth of the account. Livy was so little aware of such an embassy, that he believed the Romans, in the time of Alexander the Great, not even to have heard his name.(167) This opinion may be exaggerated; but it is highly probable that Alexander had never heard of the Romans. The complaint about the Italian pirates which he is reported to have conveyed to Italy, is not stated to have been addressed to Rome;(168) and, at all events, his prophecy of the future greatness of Rome, may be safely rejected as the invention of a later age. Memnon, an historian who wrote under the Empire, but who seems to have followed Greek authorities, says that Alexander, after he had crossed into Asia, wrote to the Romans, to inform them that they might obtain the supreme power, if they were strong enough; but if they were not, they must yield to their superiors: whereupon the Romans sent him a golden crown of the value of many talents.(169) This account, like that already quoted, bears the marks of fabrication after the time when Rome had become powerful.

---

(163) vii. 15.

(164) After speaking of Nearchus and Onesicritus, he adds, Ἄριστος δ' ὁ Σαλαμίνιος πολὺ μέν ἐστι νεώτερος τούτων, xv. 3, § 8. Compare Ste. Croix, Examen Crit. des Hist. d'Alexandre, p. 63.

(165) xvii. 113.

(166) Geier, Alex. Hist. Script. p. 159, thus sums up his character of Clitarchus: 'Jam vero si summam feceris eorum, quæ de Clitarchi genere scribendi sunt disputata, in Alexandri rebus conscribendis hoc unum ille sequebatur, ut vel rhetorico orationis nitore vel fabulosâ argumenti novitate ac varietate lectorum animos alliceret atque deliniret.'

(167) Quem ne famâ quidem illis notum arbitror fuisse. Livy, ix. 18. Appius the Blind is represented by Plut. Pyrrh. 19, as alluding to a belief

Theophrastus is said, by Pliny, to have been the first foreigner who wrote with care concerning the Romans.(170) The list of his writings, like those of his master Aristotle, is very long and miscellaneous, and it contains many works of a political character. It is nevertheless difficult to understand in which of his works he could have devoted much space to the affairs of the Romans, or from what sources his accurate information could have been derived. Dionysius, who was a diligent student, and well versed in the literature of his own country, does not seem to have known of any writing of Theophrastus respecting the

---

that if when the living generation were young men, Alexander had attacked Italy, he would have been defeated by the Romans. It is uncertain whether this rests on any historical foundation; the speech was probably borrowed from Dionysius, see Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. n. 853. Plutarch, de Fort. Rom. c. 13, says that the fate of Alexander of Epirus furnished him with a reason for an expedition to Italy, and that he had heard of the great power of Rome, and her ascendancy in Italy. Niebuhr believes the account of the Roman embassy to Alexander the Great, and treats Livy's opinion that the Romans had not heard the name of Alexander as ridiculous. Hist. vol. iii. p. 168-70; Lect. vol. i. p. 346-8. Ste. Croix, ib. p. 478, discredits the account of the Roman embassy to Alexander. See also Blum, Einleitung, p. 91.

(168) Strab. v. 3, § 5.

(169) Memnon, c. 25; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 538.

170) Theophrastus, qui primus externorum aliqua de Romanis diligentius scripsit. N. H. iii. 9. Theophrastus was born about 374, and died about 289 B.C. The passage of Theophrast. Hist. Plant. v. 8, contains the earliest mention of the Romans in any extant classical work.

history of Rome; for he says that Hieronymus and Timæus were the first Greeks who wrote on the early Roman history;(171) and Pliny can hardly allude to notices of Theophrastus respecting the natural history of the Roman territory. On the whole, it seems most probable that the statement of Pliny respecting Theophrastus is erroneous, or greatly exaggerated.

Many towns in Sicily and the southern part of Italy, and other places along the seacoast in northern Italy, Gaul, and Iberia, were noted in the Εὐρώπη of Hecatæus, who lived from about 550 to 476 B.C., and was about forty years old at the expulsion of the kings; but it is not stated that he mentioned the name of Rome.(172) Hellanicus and Damastes are reported to have named the Trojan matron Romé, in connexion with the legend of the burning of the ships; but we cannot be certain that their testimonies have come down to us in an authentic form.(173) It is certain that the inhabitants of Asia Minor, the islands, and of Eastern Greece, could have had little acquaintance with Italy, and especially with its western shores, in the first four centuries of the city; for we learn from the undoubted authority of Thucydides,(174) that the Athenians were imperfectly informed respecting the extent and importance of Sicily before their expedition under Nicias, in 415 B.C., and Sicily, being not only colonized by Greeks of various races, but also nearer to the mother-country, would be better known to the Eastern Greeks than Latium. The ignorance recorded by Livy as to the origin of the Greek fleet, which infested the coast of Campania and Latium, in the year 349 B.C., likewise betokens rare communications between Rome and Greece at that time.(175) The

---

(171) i. 6.

(172) See Hecat. Fragm. 3—65, ed. Klausen. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 556, conjectures that Hecatæus mentioned Rome—but this fact cannot be admitted without express testimony.

(173) Below, ch. 9, § 6.

(174) vi. 1. He says that the Athenians in general were at this time ignorant of the size of Sicily, and of the multitude of the Greeks and barbarians who inhabited it, and did not know that they were undertaking a greater war than that with the Peloponnesians.

(175) See Livy, vii. 25—6. Below, ch. 13.

Romans however, in early times, doubtless knew more of the Greeks than the Greeks knew of them. The Greek mythology had penetrated at an early date into Italy, as is proved by painted vases, and other works of art. The Sibylline verses were composed in Greek, and their official guardians at Rome must have been able to understand them without an interpreter.(176) The stories of the connexion of Numa with the Pythagorean philosophy, and of the Tarquinian family with Corinth, as well as of the visit of Brutus and the young Tarquins to the Delphic oracle,(177) are indeed of uncertain, though probably not very early date; nor does the embassy of the three commissioners to Greece to collect laws prior to the decemviral legislation, rest on a firm basis; but the dedication of the spoils of Veii to Apollo of Delphi, and the transmission of a golden crater to his temple, may be regarded as historical; and the same character still more belongs to the mission to fetch the sacred snake from Epidaurus, which falls only a few years before the invasion of Pyrrhus.(178)

§ 15 The result of these testimonies is, that the literary men of Greece had heard some desultory accounts of the Romans, but knew little concerning them, and had only made slight mention of them in their writings, at the time when Pyrrhus crossed into Italy. When however the contemporary Greek writers of this period began to narrate the wars of

---

(176) Dio Cass. xxxix. 16, mentions a Sibylline prophecy in Greek, and in lvii. 18, he quotes some Greek hexameter verses from a Sibylline oracle. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 506.

(177) Livy considers Greece to have been nearly unknown to the Romans in the time of Tarquinius Superbus. 'Delphos ad maxime inclitum in terris oraculum mittere statuit; neque responsa sortium ulli alii committere ausus, duos filios per ignotas eâ tempestate terras, ignotiora maria, in Græciam misit.'—i. 56. A prose discourse (λόγος) addressed by the comic poet Epicharmus to a certain Antenor, extant in the time of Plutarch, in which it was stated that the Romans admitted Pythagoras the philosopher to the rights of citizenship, was doubtless an apocryphal work. See Plut. Num. 8. Its genuineness is doubted by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 239. Epicharmus lived from 540 to 450 B.C., that is, from the reign of Servius Tullius to the time of the Decemvirate.

(178) In 292 B.C. See Livy, Epit. xi; Val. Max. i. 8, 2; Ovid. Met. xv. 622-744; Becker, vol. i. p. 651.

Pyrrhus, they naturally included his campaign against the Romans in their histories.(179) We know that Hieronymus of Cardia, a historian of this time, described the Italian campaign of Pyrrhus. He was born about 370-360 B.C., and is said to have lived 104 years, which would bring his death down to 266-256 B.C. His history was carried down to the death of Pyrrhus, or somewhat later.(180) He is cited as an authority for the Roman war of Pyrrhus, by Plutarch.(181) Dionysius, moreover, speaks of Hieronymus as having taken a summary view of the early history of Rome, in his work on the Epigoni.(182) This sketch was probably prefixed to the Italian campaign of Pyrrhus. The life of Timæus extends from about 352 to 256 B.C., and the history of Sicily was brought down to 264 B.C., the first year of the First Punic War. He wrote, however, a separate work on the wars of Pyrrhus, which were included in the period of his longer history.(183) Pyrrhus, likewise, himself wrote his own memoirs, or caused them to be written under his instruction.(184) The *Epirotica* of Proxenus was also probably the work of a writer contemporary with Pyrrhus, and treated of his history.(185) A history of the expedition of Pyrrhus against Italy and Sicily was composed by a writer named Zeno; but his date is unknown.(186)

The Roman, like the Carthaginian people, was considered by the Greeks as barbarian,(187) and its history was only regarded by them as deserving of notice, when it was connected with their own. As the Greek writers described the wars of the Greek cities in Sicily with the Carthaginians, from the times of Gelo and Dionysius, so they described the war of Pyrrhus with the Romans, as being a war in which a Greek king was concerned.

---

(179) Niebuhr remarks that foreigners began to write contemporary Roman history in the time of Pyrrhus, Hist. vol. i. p. 247.

(180) Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 450, see particularly p. 460.

(181) Pyrrh. 21. Compare Heeren de Font. vit. Plut. p. 72.

(182) i. 6.

(183) Cic. Epist. Fam. v. 12; Dion. Hal. i. 6; Polyb. xii. 4, 6. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. i. p. 231.

(184) Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 461. The letter of the consuls to Pyrrhus, Plut. c. 21, may not improbably be an authentic copy of the original despatch.

(185) Fragm. Hist. Gr. ubi sup.

(186) Ib. vol. iii. p. 174.

(187) See Cato ap. Plin. N. H., xxix. 7, and Festus in barbari, p. 36, with Müller's note. As to Rome being a Hellenic city, see Plut. Cam. 22; Aristotle, ap. Dion. Hal. i. 72; Strab. v. 3, § 3.

The military power and successes of the Romans had undoubtedly become known to Pyrrhus and his counsellors, and probably to Greeks of more distant regions, in the beginning of the third century B.C. Plutarch describes a conversation between Cineas the Thessalian orator, and Pyrrhus—in which Cineas, desirous of diverting him from his purpose of invading Italy, remarks that the Romans are said to be skilled in war, and to rule over many warlike nations, and then inquires what use he will make of his victory, if he succeeds in defeating them. 'The answer (said Pyrrhus) is obvious; we shall be masters of all Italy: when the Romans have been conquered, no Italian city, barbarian or Greek, can resist us.'(188) When Pyrrhus had come off victorious in his first encounter with a Roman consular army at Heraclea, he exulted at having been able, with only his own troops, and those of the Tarentines, and without any other Italian allies, to conquer the great Roman power.(189) After the same victory at Heraclea, when Pyrrhus, on burying the dead bodies of the Romans, observed that the wounds were all in front, he is reported to have said, that if he had the Romans for allies, he would soon be master of the world.(190) It is further mentioned, that he was elated by being considered an equal match for the Romans, and that he was desirous, for this reason, of protecting others against them, especially if they were Greeks.(191) The saying of Cineas, after he returned from his embassy to Rome, concerning the Romans, is well known—that they were a nation of generals, or, as he afterwards added, a nation of kings.(192) At the same time, seeing the rapidity with which the Roman losses in the field were repaired and new armies were formed, he told Pyrrhus, that they were fighting against a hydra.(193) When Pyrrhus sailed from Sicily, after his unsuccessful attempt upon that island, he looked back on its shores, and exclaimed, 'What an arena we leave for the Carthaginians and Romans.'(194) On the other hand, the knowledge of the military prowess of the Romans, which the Greeks possessed at this time, was derived from mere hearsay reports, and was not founded either on personal experience, or on written accounts of their campaigns. Hence Pyrrhus is related, when he first beheld the Roman army encamped on the banks of the Siris, and perceived the order and regularity of their arrangements, to have remarked to an officer, named Megacles, who was near him; 'The tactics of the barbarians are not so barbarous; we shall soon see how they can fight.'(195)

---

(188) Plut. Pyrrh. 14. (189) Ib. c. 17.

(190) Dio Cassius, Fragm. xl. 19, 20, ed. Bekker. According to Florus, i. 18, § 17, the saying of Pyrrhus on this occasion was: 'O quam facile erat orbis imperium occupare, aut mihi Romanis militibus, aut me rege Romanis.'

(191) Dio Cass. Fragm. xl. 4.

§ 16 The war of Pyrrhus was not so long prior to the time of Fabius and Cincius, as to render it improbable, that they and other subsequent writers may have collected some trustworthy notices of it from native tradition and documents.(196) It has been already stated, that the speech which Appius the Blind delivered in the Senate on the occasion of the embassy of Cineas, was extant in the time of Cicero. But even assuming that the events of that war were preserved almost exclusively by Greek writers, we still have, from the year 281 B.C. to the close of the Republic, an unbroken stream of Roman history, for more than two centuries, founded on the evidence of trustworthy contemporaneous writers. Although that evidence is not now, for the most part, extant in its original state, yet it served as the foundation of the secondary compilations which have descended to us from antiquity, and we have no reason to doubt that these works have in substance reproduced it with fidelity. If the original sources of Roman history, for the last two centuries of the Republic, which were accessible to Dionysius and Livy, to Plutarch, Diodorus, Appian, and Dio Cassius, were now extant, we should perhaps be able to detect many instances of error and carelessness in subordinate points, and above all, we should be able to recover many material facts which are now irrecoverably lost, and to fill up many chasms in the narrative; but the cardinal facts in the history of the period in question,—the main outline of the wars with Pyrrhus, the Gauls, the Carthaginians, the Greeks, the Spaniards, and the Libyans, of the commotions of the Gracchi, and the civil wars of Marius and Sylla, would remain unchanged: the history might have more flesh and blood; but its skeleton would be the same.

---

(192) Appian, H. R., iii. 10; Dio Cass. Fragm. xl. 41. Livy, ix. 17, refers this saying to the Senate: 'Senatus ille, quem qui ex regibus constare dixit, unus veram speciem Romani Senatûs cepit.' Plut. Pyrrh. 19, and Florus i. 18, § 20, agree with Livy. The complimentary expressions of Cineas are indeed discredited by Dr. Arnold, vol. ii. p. 499, but they are likely to owe their origin to contemporary writers, and his surprise at finding the Romans so formidable a people was probably great and genuine.

(193) Plut. Pyrrh. and Appian, ib.; Flor. i. 18, § 19.

(194) Plut. Pyrrh. 23, ad fin.

(195) Plut. Pyrrh. 16, Flaminin. 5. The same remark is attributed by Livy to king Philip, when he first saw the Roman camp, 200 B.C., xxxi. 34. It is possible that the same observation may have been made by both independently.

(196) Hannibal, who commanded the Carthaginian fleet in the action with Duilius, in the First Punic War (260 B.C.), fought in a septireme which had belonged to King Pyrrhus. Polyb. i. 23. P. Scipio Africanus, the Elder, was stated by Fabius to have had a conversation with Hannibal at Ephesus, in 193 B.C., when he was on a mission to Antiochus, in which Hannibal alluded to the influence obtained by Pyrrhus in Italy, as a well known fact. Livy xxxv. 15. Livy also describes Hannibal as mentioning the warning sent by the Roman Senate to Pyrrhus to beware of poison, shortly before his death, in 182 B.C. xxxix. 57. Pyrrhus and Hannibal

The account of the Italian war of Pyrrhus, in Plutarch's Life, is just as credible, and just as much derived from coeval testimony, as his account of the other wars of Pyrrhus, in Macedonia and Peloponnesus. The contemporary accounts of all these wars have been lost, but the secondary and derivative accounts are not the less credible. The lives of the Gracchi, of Marius, and of Sylla, by Plutarch, are for the same reason

---

are classed together as invaders of Italy, and formidable enemies of Rome, by Lucan, i. 30. The palace of Pyrrhus, at Ambracia, was still remembered in 189 B.C., when the place was attacked by the Romans. Livy, xxxviii. 9; cf. 5.

just as credible as his lives of Alexander, Dion, Timoleon, or Aratus. All of these lives were founded on contemporary writings, which were extant in the time of Plutarch, but have unfortunately perished in the deluge which has submerged so large a portion of ancient historical literature. In like manner, the detailed history of Sicilian affairs, during the times of the two Dionysii and Agathocles, which is related by Diodorus, may be safely relied upon as authentic, because it is founded on the works of Antiochus, Philistus, Athanas, Ephorus, Theopompus, Timæus, and other contemporaries;(197) though Diodorus himself lived in the age of Augustus, and the Sicilian histories which he followed are no longer in existence.

---

(197) Concerning the original historians for this period of Sicilian history, followed by Diodorus, see Heyne de Font. Diod. vol. 1, p. lxxxv.—ix. ed. Bipont.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE SOURCES OF ROMAN HISTORY, FOR THE PERIOD BEFORE THE WAR WITH PYRRHUS.

(753—281 B.C.)

§ 1 IN the previous chapter we have followed the stream of Roman contemporary history up to the war of Pyrrhus, but found that at that point the contemporary writers deserted us. There is no trace of any historical account of Roman affairs, by a contemporary writer, native or foreign, before that time; nor can it be shown that any Roman literary work, either in verse or prose, was then in existence. But although there was no contemporary history, and no native literature, at Rome, before the war with Pyrrhus; yet we have a history of Rome for 472 years before that period, handed down to us by ancient classical writers, as a credible narrative of events. Let us, therefore, inquire what were the sources from which this history of nearly five centuries was derived, and whether it is sufficiently authenticated by trustworthy evidence, to command our assent.

Without now concerning ourselves with the discrepancies between the several accounts, we may begin by remarking that for the entire period from the foundation of the city by Romulus, down to the war of Pyrrhus, there is a received narrative of Roman history, which all the native writers agree in recognising, and which was, during the literary age of Rome, fixed in the popular belief. The outline of this history is, that Æneas, having escaped from the sack of Troy, after many wanderings, at last gained a firm footing, with his companions, at Lavinium, on the Latin coast of Italy: that his immediate descendants founded the city of Alba—and that Rome was, after several generations, founded by Romulus, the son of Mars, by a daughter of a king of Alba: that Romulus was the first of the seven kings of Rome: that after a duration of nearly two centuries and a half, the royalty was abolished in consequence of the outrage offered by the king's son to Lucretia: that two annual consuls were appointed at the head of the government: that a disastrous war with Porsena, intended to restore the exiled Tarquins, ensued—which was distinguished by various renowned exploits, of Mucius Scævola, of Horatius Cocles, of Clœlia: that a series of domestic and military events followed; of which, as to constitutional changes, the most important were the creation of the offices of Dictator and Tribune of the people, the Decemviral legislation, the Licinian laws in favour of the plebeians: while of the military events the most prominent were, the war with Coriolanus, the disaster of the Cremera, the siege of Veii, the capture of Rome by the Gauls, the war with the Latins, and the three Samnite wars.

§ 2 The whole of this history was narrated in the first eleven books of Livy. The first ten books are extant, and bring down the narrative to the consulship of Fabius Maximus Gurges and Junius Brutus Scæva, in 292 B.C. The eleventh book (which is lost) contained the events of the years 291—286 B.C., and therefore included the year 290 B.C., in which the third Samnite war was brought to a conclusion. In the twelfth book, the arrival of Pyrrhus at Tarentum was described.

As we have already seen, the principal object of Livy was to relate the history of the later period of the Republic—and to this portion of time he devoted the chief part of his work: though, following the example of many of his predecessors, he commenced his narrative from the foundation of the city.

The Roman history of Dionysius was written with a different purpose, and therefore framed upon a different plan. His object was to remove the erroneous notions of the Greeks respecting the origin and antiquities of the Roman Commonwealth. Dionysius came to Rome in the year 29 B.C., and remained there for twenty-two years, until 7 B.C., when he published his history —having been occupied during the whole of that time in studying the Roman language and history, and in collecting materials for his work.(1) He says, in the proem to his history, that the Greeks had, partly from prejudice against the Romans, their superiors in arms, and partly from the want of correct information, formed erroneous and unworthy notions of the origin of Rome, and of its early history. With the view, therefore, of dissipating these errors and removing this ignorance, and of proving that the Romans are a Hellenic, not a barbarous people; that they were not descended from a few ignoble wanderers and outcasts; and that their military successes were not merely of recent times, but dated back from the earliest periods of the city:(2) he undertakes to write the history of Rome, from the most ancient fables, until the beginning of the First Punic War.(3)

The work of Dionysius consisted of twenty books(4)—the first nine are extant, in a complete state. Of the tenth and eleventh, the chief part is preserved, but they are incomplete—of the remaining nine there are only fragments and extracts.

The first four books are devoted to the preliminary history, and to the period of the kings. The fifth book begins with the establishment of the consuls: and the eleventh book (imperfect) ends with the year 443 B.C.=311 U.C. The capture of Rome by the Gauls, was described in B. 13; the first Samnite war, in B. 15; the war with Pyrrhus, in B. 17—19. The twentieth book included the events between the war with Pyrrhus and the First Punic War; so that the history ended in the third year of the 128th Olympiad, 266 B.C., from which period he stated that the history of Polybius began, with whose work, therefore, his own was intended to connect.(5) The history of the 364 years, from the foundation of the city to the Gallic conflagration, was included by Dionysius in thirteen books—and the remaining seven books were devoted to the 126 years until the First Punic War: whereas Livy comprehends the period down to the capture of the city by the Gauls, in five books; and devotes ten books to the 126 years until the First Punic War.(6)

---

(1) i. 7—8. (2) i. 3—5. (3) i. 8.

(4) Phot. Bibl. cod. 83.

(5) Phot. Bibl. ib. Polybius states that he begins his history in the 129th Olympiad, 264 B.C., and that it connects with that of Timæus, i. 5. Dionysius likewise composed and published an abridgment of his own longer history, in five books. Phot. cod. 84. The execution of the Campanian legion in 271 B.C. is described in an extant fragment, xx. 8.

For the entire course of Roman history we have the compendious narratives of Florus and Eutropius; the latter a writer of the fourth century after Christ, whose work is dedicated to the Emperor Valens, and who did little more than abridge Livy: the former wrote under Trajan, or Hadrian. The work of Florus reaches from the foundation of the city to the time of Augustus; that of Eutropius from the same period to the accession of Valens. These works, though valueless as critical authorities, exhibit the version of early Roman history generally received under the Empire.(7) To these may be added the Universal History of Orosius, which though written with the limited purpose of exhibiting the calamities and disasters of the heathen times of Rome, may be received as good evidence of the version of early Roman history, which was accredited in the fifth century. The extant work 'De Origine Gentis Romanæ,' which contains an account of the early mythology and foundation of Rome, has been regarded as a modern forgery, but appears rather to be a late compilation by an ancient author. The passages to which it refers are however in part from apocryphal or fictitious works. The collection of short biographical notices, entitled 'De Viris illustribus Urbis Romæ,' which, like the previous work, bears the name of Sextus Aurelius Victor, is of a better stamp, but is nevertheless the production of a late and ignorant compiler.(8)

Many brief notices of Roman affairs are introduced by Diodorus, under the proper years, in his Universal History, the composition of which occupied him thirty years, which was published under Augustus, and extended from the remotest fabulous ages to the Gallic war of Julius Cæsar. He states that, having been a native of the Sicilian town of Agyrium, he had, from the frequent intercourse with the Romans in Sicily, acquired a familiar knowledge of their language, and that he had related the events of their history from memoirs preserved among them from early times.(9) The voyage of Æneas to Latium, and the foundation of Rome, were only mentioned by Diodorus in his seventh book, and the reign of Tarquinius Superbus in his tenth book: and of the books of his history, from vi. to x., fragments are alone extant. Various events of Roman history from the consulship of Cassius and Virginius, in 486 B.C., to that of Livius and Æmilius, in 302 B.C., are mentioned in the ten extant books, from xi. to xx.

---

(6) The first book of Dionysius is introductory, and the history of the first 364 years is properly contained in b. 2—13, which gives nearly an average of 30 years for each of these books. The remaining seven books contained on an average only 18 years each.

(7) Concerning Florus and Eutropius, see Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. lxxii., with the exception of a few brief notices of the reign of Romulus, all the Roman history of Velleius Paterculus is lost down to the war with Perseus, 171 B.C.

(8) See Schwegler, vol. i. p. 117.

Five Roman lives of Plutarch fall within the period before the war with Pyrrhus: viz., those of Romulus, Numa, Publicola, Coriolanus, and Camillus. The lives of Pyrrhus and Fabius do not belong to the times which we are considering.

Appian of Alexandria, likewise, who lived at Rome under Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius, and composed a Roman history in twenty-four books, devoted his first book to the kingly period; and treated of a portion of the events of the early centuries in the books relating to the affairs of Italy, the Samnites, the Celts, and Sicily (books ii.—v.) These books however are only extant in excerpts and fragments.

Dio Cassius, born about 153 A.D., wrote a Roman history in eighty books, from the foundation of the city to 229 A.D.;(10) all the portion of it, however, which relates to the period anterior to 89 B.C. is lost, and only fragments of it remain.(11) A compendium of the early part of his work has been preserved by Zonaras, a compiler of the 12th century, who appears to have extracted his narrative of this period from Dio, except in particular places, where he followed Plutarch.

---

(9) *ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐξ Ἀγυρίου τὸ γένος τῆς Σικελίας ὄντες, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐπιμιξίαν τοῖς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πολλὴν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου περιπεποιημένοι, πάσας τὰς τῆς ἡγεμονίας ταύτης πράξεις ἀκριβῶς ἀνελάβομεν ἐκ τῶν παρ' ἐκείνοις ὑπομνημάτων ἐκ πολλῶν χρόνων τετηρημένων*, i. 4. This statement indicates that the notices of Roman history in Diodorus were extracted from Roman, not from Greek writers. Compare Heyne de Font. Diod. p. lxxxix. vol. 1, ed. Bipont.

(10) See his account of the origin of his history, lxxii. 23.

(11) The fragments of Dio, down to 282 B.C., occupy 36 pages in Bekker's edition, Lips. 1849. Dio claims the credit of having used his authorities with discrimination: see the imperfect fragment, i. 2, in

§ 3 Besides the writers who treat professedly of the early ages of Rome, either as historians or biographers, there are copious sources of indirect information respecting the events of this period. In the first place, there are the voluminous writings of Cicero, among which the Dialogue de Republicâ follows the early constitutional history from the foundation of the city; while the other dialogues or treatises—particularly the Brutus and the work de Oratore—frequently contain allusions to events in the prior history of Rome. The collection of sayings and deeds of great men, by Valerius Maximus, who wrote under Tiberius, and the later compilations of military anecdotes, by Frontinus and Polyænus, likewise repeat many stories from the early Roman annals. All the Latin prose writers whose works are preserved—as Sallust, Tacitus, Seneca, Quintilian, Pliny the Elder, Macrobius and Gellius, as well as Augustine, and other of the Christian fathers—contain allusions to various occurrences in the early history, and prove the existence of an uniform version which was generally received. The grammarians and commentators, such as Servius, Festus, and Asconius, may be added to the list: and the jurists, such as Pomponius, extracts of whose works are preserved in the Digest. The Roman poets, likewise, from Lucretius and Virgil down to Claudian and Ausonius, abound with allusions to events of the early Roman story. Virgil, in particular, whose great epic has, to a considerable extent, the character of a court poem written for the glorification of the Julian family, exhausts his ingenuity in connecting the lineage and exploits of Augustus with the legendary and primitive history of Rome.(12) Ovid's Fasti, of which six books

---

Bekker. Compare Wachsmuth Aeltere Geschichte des Röm. Staats, p. 50, and the Treatise De Vitâ et Scriptis Dionis Cassii, in the edition of Reimarus, vol. ii. p. 1533.

(12) See Nieb. Hist. vol. i. p. 197, on Virgil's learning.

have unfortunately been lost, are occupied in explaining the origins of the religious and civil observances prescribed by the Roman calendar. His Metamorphoses likewise touch at the end on the series of the Roman kings.

In fact all the Roman, and most of the Greek writers who were posterior to the extension of the Roman power over the civilized world, contain allusions and references, more or less numerous and detailed, to events of Roman history falling within the first five centuries after the building of the city. Strabo may in particular be mentioned as a Greek writer who frequently adverts to the primitive history of Rome. The remains of Polybius, the miscellaneous works of Plutarch, as his Quæstiones Romanæ, his Apophthegms, his treatise on the Fortune of Rome, likewise have occasional reference to this period of Roman history. The work of the late and ignorant compiler, Johannes Lydus, on the Roman magistracies, likewise contains many allusions to the early period of Roman history.(13)

§ 4 The account of the period of nearly five centuries, from the building of Rome to the war of Pyrrhus, is delivered to us by Livy and Dionysius, and the other historians, with a full and undoubting belief in its general truth; no distinction as to credibility is made between this and the later history. That the history which has thus descended to us was received as such by the Roman people, is proved by the incidental allusions of orators, poets, and philosophers, who ornament their language, enforce their argument, or illustrate their meaning, by references to events known and believed by their hearers or readers. Such historical references would be useless and inapplicable, if the facts adduced were not generally believed to be authentic, and were not a part of the popular historical creed.

§ 5 The first question therefore which we are called upon to solve is, what were the materials out of which Dionysius, Livy, Plutarch, Cicero, and other extant writers, derived their accounts of the period of Rome antecedent to contemporary history?

---

(13) Concerning the value of this work, see Schwegler, vol. i. p. 129. Johannes Lydus was a Byzantine writer of the sixth century.

Now we have already seen that there was a long series of native historical writers reaching from the Second Punic War to the time of Dionysius and Livy—a period of nearly 200 years—many of whom commenced their account from the very origin of Rome. All these works, including even the celebrated *Origines* of Cato the Censor, have perished; but they were all extant at the time when the principal histories on which we rely were composed, and were, as we know from the references of the historians, consulted by them. The received narrative of Roman history up to the invasion of Pyrrhus was certainly not framed for the first time by writers as late as Dionysius and Livy, but was already in existence at their time, and was in substance derived by them from the writings of their predecessors. This narrative (as we shall have occasion to show lower down) was subject to wide discrepancies, as it was delivered by different authors: still there were certain prominent features in which all, or the great majority, agreed, and thus a received version, a vulgate edition, of the early history was extant in the last century of the Republic, which was the subject of national recognition, which furnished precedents and arguments to all parties in political discussion, and which, if alluded to in poetry, or the drama, was immediately acknowledged by all Romans as a matter of common interest.

§ 6 If the writings in which this narrative was first published to the Roman citizens, and was first brought under the eye of a reader, were now extant, we should be able to judge of the discretion, sagacity, and fairness with which Livy, Dionysius, and the other extant historians, used their materials for this period. At present we can only form conjectures, and draw indirect and uncertain inferences on this subject. Even, however, if the works of these historians were extant, a further question would require solution; namely, what were the authorities on which they relied, and from which they framed their narrative? What were the materials for the history of Rome from the foundation of the city to the war of Pyrrhus, out of which Fabius, Cincius, Cato, and other historians down to Valerius Antias, constructed their account? We propose therefore to commence our inquiry by examining what were the sources from which the earliest Roman historians derived the history of Rome for the 473 years from the foundation of the city, in 753 B.C., to the landing of Pyrrhus in Italy, in 281 B.C.

§ 7 The earliest native Roman writers, who professedly composed the history of their own country, in a prose narrative, were, as we have already seen, Q. Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus. Fabius served in the Gallic war of 225 B.C., but both of them were contemporary with the Second Punic War, and probably were born about the year 250 B.C., Cincius (14) being perhaps five or ten years the junior. Their births would thus fall not far from the middle of the First Punic War; and they were in the prime of their life during the Second Punic War.

The family of Fabius Pictor belonged to the Fabian gens, and was patrician. Cincius was of a distinguished plebeian family:(15) both of whom were senators, had filled high magistracies, had served in the field, and had thus been practically conversant with civil and military affairs. After the battle of Cannæ, in 216 B.C., Fabius was sent on the honourable and, as it was then considered, important mission to Delphi, in order to consult the oracle on the means to be adopted for removing the anger of the gods at that critical moment. Cincius is reported by Livy to have heard from Hannibal an account of his losses in the north of Italy, after his passage over the Alps.(16) Whether

---

(14) Dion. Hal. i. 79, describes Cincius as adopting the statement of Fabius concerning the birth of Romulus and Remus, as if he was a subsequent writer. In vii. 71, he calls Fabius the most ancient historian. Scriptorum antiquissimus, Livy, i. 44.

(15) The Cincian family was of sufficient importance to have a large monument in Rome, with statues. Festus, p. 57, ed. Müller. 'Cincia locus Romæ, ubi Cinciorum monimentum fuit.' Ib. p. 262. 'Romanam portam vulgus appellat, ubi ex epistylio defluit aqua, qui locus ab antiquis appellari solitus est statuæ Cinciæ, quod in eo fuit sepulcrum ejus familiæ.' Concerning the Porta Romana, see Becker, vol. i. p. 113.

(16) Hannibal had learned Greek from Sosilus, a Lacedæmonian, who attended him in his campaigns. Nepos Hann. ad fin. The anecdote in Cic. de Orat. ii. 18, about Hannibal's contempt for Phormio's lecture

Cincius obtained this information with a view to his history, does not appear. Fabius is censured by Polybius for his partiality towards his own countrymen in his account of the First and Second Punic Wars, but is acquitted of all intentional misrepresentation. They both wrote in Greek, which was at this time the only literary language—Latin was still in a rude and unformed state—and though Nævius was born about twenty years before Fabius, and composed his poem in Saturnian verse about 210—200 B.C., yet no considerable Latin work had yet been written in prose. Fabius would hardly have been selected as envoy to Delphi, if he had not been conversant with the Greek language.

Both of them were from their position competent witnesses and judges of the events of their own time; if Fabius wrote with partiality towards his own country, he is not the only contemporary historian obnoxious to this charge. Their main object doubtless was to compose the history of the two Punic Wars;(17) the second of which they had witnessed, and indeed had taken part in it; and of the first the memory was still recent. The events of the First Punic War must have had a strong and practical interest to the Romans, so long as the Second Punic War was undecided, and while its event was still doubtful. In the First Punic War the Romans were victorious; in the second, they had sustained the most destructive defeats, and were threatened with utter extinction(18) The severe terms, moreover, imposed upon

---

about war, at Ephesus, also shows that he understood Greek, though it is stated that he did not speak it correctly. 'Hic Pœnus, *non optime Græce*, sed tamen libere, respondisse fertur.' Cincius might therefore have conversed with Hannibal in Greek. The memorial inscription which Hannibal set up in the temple of the Lacinian Juno was in Carthaginian and Greek. Livy, xxviii. 46. Hannibal seems to have addressed the Tarentines in Greek. Polyb. viii. 33. The communication with the Roman prisoners, described ib. iii. 85, was probably through an interpreter.

(17) Niebuhr, Lect. vol. ii. p. 71, remarks that the first, but more especially the second war against Carthage, was the real subject of the annals of Fabius and Cincius. A similar remark with respect to Fabius is made, ib. vol. i. p. xxvii.

(18) It is well known that L. Cæcilius Metellus is reported to have advised the Romans to abandon Italy after Cannæ, and to take refuge with some of the kings. Livy xxii. 53. In xxvii. 11, Livy calls him 'infamis auctor deserendæ Italiæ post Cannensem cladem,' which was the

the Carthaginians by the Romans at the end of the first war, were the true cause of the renewal of hostilities and of the commencement of the second war.(19)

If these writers began to collect materials for their history of the First Punic War in the years 220—200 B.C., they might have obtained oral accounts of it from aged persons whose memory extended as far back as its commencement. A man eighty years old, in the year 220 B.C., would have been born in the year 300 B.C., and would therefore not only remember as a contemporary of mature age, the events of the First Punic War, which began in 264 B.C., and lasted twenty-four years, but he might also recal the leading events of the war with Pyrrhus, who would have landed in Italy when he was nineteen years of age. A man only seventy years old, in 220 B.C., would have reached his twenty-eighth year at the breaking out of the First Punic War.

Fabius and Cincius might therefore have written, as contemporaries themselves, or from information furnished directly by contemporaries, for the period including the first two Punic Wars, 264—201 B.C., and for any later time comprehended within their histories. Taking the criterion of Polybius, who extends his detailed history over the time with which he was personally conversant, and that which was witnessed by the preceding generation,(20) we may consider Fabius and Cincius as giving the results of original observations, on grounds of adequate credibility, from the commencement of the First Punic War. If, says Polybius, we go beyond the testimony of our fathers, who can recount to us the events which they themselves witnessed, and attempt to found our history upon hearsay evidence, by fol-

---

reason why the censors some years afterwards excluded him from the Senate. Compare Val. Max. v. 6, § 7; Script. de vir. ill. 49; Sil. Ital. x. 415—25; Dio Cass. Fragm. lvii. 29.

(19) Polyb. iii. 9. Livy says of Rome and Carthage, when they entered upon the Second Punic War: 'Haud ignotas belli artes inter se, sed expertas primo Punico conserebant bello' . . . 'Odiis etiam prope majoribus certarunt, quam viribus: Romanis indignantibus, quod victoribus victi ultro inferrent arma; Pœnis, quod superbe avareque credebant imperitatum victis esse.'—xxi. 1.

(20) Polyb. iv. 2.

lowing the oral report of an oral report, we tread upon insecure ground. In calculating the back period which the memory of the preceding generation will cover, Polybius only allows about twenty years before the historian's own life. His own history, properly, begins in the war 220 B.C., and he was himself born about 204 B.C. A somewhat longer period may however be fairly assumed.

Fabius and Cincius were both men prominently engaged in the political and military service of their country. Their attention, as writers of history, was doubtless directed principally to their own time, and to that immediately preceding. Accordingly, Dionysius informs us, that they wrote fully, and with detail, upon the events with which they had been personally conversant; but that they gave only a general summary of the ancient period, after the foundation of the city.(21) He compares the early portion of their works with the accounts of Roman antiquity introduced into the histories of Hieronymus, Timæus, and other Greek writers, which he censures as brief, meagre, and unsatisfactory.(22) In another passage, he refers to Fabius as a high authority; as being the most ancient native historian, and deriving his information not only from what he heard, but also from the facts of which he had personal cognizance.(23)

---

(21) In like manner, Dio Cassius, speaking of the reign of Commodus, says that he relates the events with fuller detail, and at greater length, than those of arlier eages; because he had personal knowledge of them. *Καὶ μέντοι καὶ τἆλλα πάντα τὰ ἐπ' ἐμοῦ πραχθέντα καὶ λεπτουργήσω καὶ λεπτολογήσω μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ πρότερα, ὅτι τε συνεγενόμην αὐτοῖς, καὶ ὅτι μηδένα ἄλλον οἶδα τῶν τι δυναμένων ἐς συγγραφὴν ἄξιον λόγου καταθέσθαι διηκριβωκότα αὐτὰ ὁμοίως ἐμοί.*—lxxii. 18.

(22) i. 6. Dionysius, iv. 15, (as emended by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. note 973) speaks of Fabius and Vennonius as less deserving of credit than Cato, with respect to the tribes of Servius Tullius. He evidently considers Cato as the chief authority on an antiquarian point of this sort. The passage of Dionysius is unintelligible as it stands in the manuscripts, without some conjectural alteration. The emendation of Niebuhr, is approved by Becker, vol. ii. 1, p. 167, note 357. Dionysius, iv. 6, 30, twice points out chronological errors committed by Fabius, in his account of the Tarquinian family. The account followed by Fabius certainly involves chronological impossibilities; but he doubtless followed the version of the story which he received from some oral or written source; and he can only be censured for a want of acuteness in not detecting its inconsistencies.

(23) vii. 71.

Fabius seems to have derived from his family a greater acquaintance with the Greek language and modes of thought than was common among the Romans of his time. He is also stated to have followed Diocles of Peparethus, in his account of Romulus and Remus;(24) but it is not probable (as is conjectured by Niebuhr) that he wrote the early part of his history in order to 'counteract the contempt with which the Greeks regarded the Romans.'(25) Dionysius, indeed, as he distinctly informs us, had this object in composing his history; but Fabius doubtless wished to give a complete narrative of the history of his country from the beginning, in order to prefix it to the main subject of his work—the account of the Punic wars. The Romans having been victorious over Hannibal and the great Carthaginian power, had now reached an eminence which rendered them worthy of having the entire history of their State recounted. No such history then existed, and the want of it would naturally suggest itself to a person having the most superficial acquaintance with the Greek language and literary habits: for a historical literature had existed for some time among the Greeks. Herodotus was born in 484 B.C., more than 200 years before the birth of Fabius Pictor, and numerous historical works existed in Greece in his lifetime. He doubtless chose the Greek language as being a cultivated language, and not because he wished to write for a Greek public. He wrote in Greek for the same reason that the early medieval chronicles were generally written in Latin, and that Grotius wrote his Dutch history in the same language; viz., because the native or vulgar tongue was in too rude a state for regular prose composition.(26) Cincius, who wrote at nearly the same time, selected the same language as the vehicle of history; and it is very unlikely that both these persons, who led the active life of well-born Romans, and lived in times of danger and movement, should have written histories, addressed, not to their own countrymen, but to a foreign public with which they had little concern, and for whose good opinion they were probably quite indifferent.

---

(24) Plut. Rom. 3. This passage is so worded that it is not clear whether Fabius is meant to have borrowed from the writer, or merely to have adopted the same version of the story. The former, however, appears rather to be Plutarch's meaning. Compare c. 8, ad fin.

(25) Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 8; Lect. vol. i. p. xxvi.

(26) This view is taken by Schwegler, ib. p. 76.

The most probable supposition therefore is, that Fabius and Cincius, being masters of the Greek language, and having had some literary cultivation in it, were stimulated by the stirring and important occurrences of their eventful time, in which they had borne a personal, and not undistinguished part, to record its history,(27) and that of the former successful war waged by their fathers against the same nation.(28) Having determined to execute this task, they naturally sought to deduce the pedigree of the great Roman family from its origin, and to trace the steps by which their Commonwealth had reached its actual stage of greatness, and had been able to extend its victorious arms over so wide a surface. When we consider the energy, intelligence, and systematic fixed principles of policy with which the Romans had not only conducted the two Punic wars, but which they had exhibited in their resistance to Pyrrhus, we must feel satisfied that they could not have been indifferent about their own early history. A nation which held so strictly to legal and constitutional precedent, in the administration of public affairs, and to an established course of practice,(29) must have possessed an accredited, if not an authentic and true tradition respecting its past transactions; respecting its former successes, dangers, and reverses; respecting its great men and their great deeds; respecting the origins of the political forms, the military regulations, and the religious institutes round which their patriotic feelings clustered, and which, in their belief, were the sources of their power and greatness. The leading families of the state, in whom the high and important offices, civil and religious, were almost hereditary, who furnished a succession of consuls, prætors, censors, quæstors, and pontiffs, to the Roman people, and who successively contributed members to the dignified Roman senate,(30) were doubtless the depositaries of a traditionary belief respecting the past ages of the city. How far this belief was authentic, and adequately supplied the place of a history written contemporaneously with the events, or taken down from the mouths of contemporaries, we shall inquire presently. But that such a fixed belief in a history of Rome, from its foundation up to the time of Pyrrhus, was then in existence among the more intelligent and instructed portion of the Roman people, and particularly among those who took a prominent part in the conduct of its public affairs, cannot be doubted by any one who considers the political and social state of Rome during the Punic wars.

---

(27) See Livy's account of the importance of the Second Punic War, at the beginning of b. xxi.

(28) See Polyb. i. 13, ad fin. on the importance and magnitude of the First Punic War.

(29) Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque. Ennius ap. Cicer. Rep. v. 1.

Now Fabius and Cincius were doubtless merely somewhat favourable specimens of the class to which they belonged, possessing, probably, more literary cultivation, and more mental activity, than fell to the lot of most of the highborn Romans who, in their age, filled important offices under the Republic. But they were not intellectual giants; they had not the profound sagacity, the sceptical and patient industry, the discriminating and acute judgment, of a Thucydides; they had not even the liveliness and graphic power which enabled Herodotus and Xenophon to invest simple narrative with unfailing interest. They may, as it appears, be compared rather with such writers as Villehardouin, Froissart, Monstrelet, and many other medieval chroniclers, who recorded, in a perspicuous and unpretending style, the historical facts for which they had collected the evidence. Fabius and Cincius were respectable and credible authorities for the events of their own and the immediately preceding time. With respect to an age lying beyond the reports of original witnesses with whom they could converse, they were probably not very critical inquirers. We may conjecture that they registered the current belief concerning the history of the first centuries of the city, as it was generally accepted among the great political families, and among the people at large, in their time, but without testing it by any such close scrutiny as that which Thucydides exercised upon the history of the Pisistratidæ,(31) and even without subjecting it to such an ingenious, though useless, analysis as that which he applied to the Trojan war. Cincius however appears to have made some antiquarian researches, as well as to have collected oral evidence of the events of his own time; for Livy, in speaking of the ancient practice of appointing a dictator, in order to drive a nail into the Temple of Jupiter, as a mark of the year, mentions that Cincius, who was a diligent reporter of such memorials, bore witness to the existence of similar nails, fixed as a chronological record of the years, in the Temple of Nortia, the Etruscan goddess, at Volsinii, where they were to be seen in his time.(32)

---

(30) See the story of the saying of Cineas after his return from Rome. It is well known what were the impediments which obstructed the political career of a *novus homo*, even in the later period of the Republic. These impediments were still greater at the time of the Punic wars, and the high offices of the state were then for the most part distributed among a limited number of families, whose nobility was not the less marked and recognised, because it was without the foundation of an hereditary title. This system of practically confining the chief offices of the Republic to a small number of Roman families, must have tended, by preserving political traditions, and concentrating political interest, to perpetuate the history of the past. Compare the well-known passage of Cicero, Verr. v. 70. 'Non idem mihi licet, quod iis qui nobili genere nati sunt; *quibus omnia populi Romani beneficia dormientibus deferuntur:* longe aliâ mihi lege in hâc civitate et conditione vivendum est. Venit enim mihi in mentem M. Catonis, hominis sapientissimi et vigilantissimi: qui quum se virtute, non genere, populo Romano commendare putaret, *quum ipse sui generis initium ac nominis ab se gigni et propagari vellet,* hominum potentissimorum suscepit inimicitias, et maximis in laboribus usque ad summam senectutem summâ cum gloriâ vixit.'

§ 8 So far as the collection of accounts of the early centuries from oral tradition was concerned, Fabius and Cincius were in a more favourable position than any of the subsequent historians, because they stood nearer to the events. Cato, who may be considered as next after them, among the native writers, was the first Roman who wrote a history of his country in Latin. His history, however, as we have already seen, was planned as a work of origins; and accordingly the first three books narrated the events of the regal period at Rome, and the origins of the Italian cities. The four remaining books took up the history from the Punic wars, and, therefore, the whole intervening period between the expulsion of the kings, and the beginning of the First Punic War, was omitted.

---

(31) See Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 122.

(32) Volsiniis quoque clavos indices numeri annorum, fixos in templo Nortiæ Etruscæ deæ, comparere, diligens talium monimentorum auctor Cincius affirmat. Livy, vii. 3. The hypothesis of Krause and others that the antiquarian treatises attributed to a writer named Cincius, are not by Cincius the historian, may raise a doubt whether Livy alludes to L. Cincius Alimentus, whom he names at length in xxi. 38; but it is probable that he means the same writer whom he elsewhere quotes.

Cato exhibited all the characteristic features of the genuine Roman in prominent relief. He was profoundly attached to the ancient usages and customs of his country; and he has many points of strong resemblance with the Spartan character, though combined with an activity and practical talent in which the Lacedæmonians were generally deficient.(33) He was probably born about twenty years after Fabius; but he did not compose his historical work until he had reached an advanced age (about 170 B.C.) Being a devoted admirer of everything belonging to Roman antiquity,(34) and a hater of all that was foreign, it was natural that he should repudiate the practice of writing in Greek,(35) and should first attempt the composition of a history in Latin. Ennius had by this time bent the stubborn Latin language into hexameters, rugged indeed, but containing some sparks of poetry ;(36) and by its use for oratorical purposes, as well as for the drama, it had now been sufficiently polished for perspicuous prose composition: of this fact we have sufficient evidence in the treatise on Agriculture by Cato himself, which is still extant. We know how long the Greek literature possessed harmonious and polished poetry, in various metres, before any prose work was composed; and a similar backwardness in attempting the composition of prose history, might have continued longer in Rome, if the vigorous mind and strong will of Cato had not broken through the imaginary obstacle. But although Cato struck into a new path, in choosing his native language as the vehicle of his composition, he could not have had access to any information respecting the regal period at Rome, or the early history of the Italian cities, which was not at least equally accessible to his predecessors Fabius and Cincius. Cato was born 276 years after the expulsion of the kings, and 519 years after the foundation of Rome; the termination of the period of early history, occupying 244 years, which was included in his work, was nearly 300 years before his birth, and nearly 350 years before the time when he was employed in writing it. Moreover, as far as we can judge from the remains of the first book of Cato's Origines, much of it was devoted to the events prior to the foundation of

---

(33) See Livy, xxxix. 40. Cic. de Orat. iii. 33. The anecdotes of Cato related by Plutarch in his life, c. 9. have a very Spartan air. The Roman censorship, which Cato exercised with so much severity, was, so far as its moral jurisdiction was concerned, quite in the Lacedæmonian spirit.

(34) See Plut. Cat. Maj. 20, as to his writing his history with his own hand, and in large characters, in order that his son might be benefited by acquiring at home a knowledge of the ancient exploits of his own countrymen: *ὅπως οἰκόθεν ὑπάρχῃ τῷ παιδὶ πρὸς ἐμπειρίαν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ πατρίων ὠφελεῖσθαι.* Literary works were usually dictated to slaves, and written in a cursive hand.

(35) Cato did not study Greek literature until he was quite advanced in life (Plut. Cat. Maj. 2: Cic. de Sen. 1), but he doubtless knew the language before. The conversations with Nearchus, the Pythagorean, at Tarentum, when he was quite a young man (*κομιδῇ μειράκιον ὤν*), respecting Plato's doctrines on the body and the soul, were doubtless held in Greek: Plut. ib. Cato brought Ennius from Sardinia to Rome, when he was quæstor in 204 B.C.—Nepos Cat. i. Fischer ad ann.; and it is stated that he learnt Greek from Ennius. 'In præturâ Sardiniam subegit, ubi ab

---

Ennio Græcis literis institutus.' Script. de vir. ill. c. 47, see Enn. Ann. Fragm. p. x. ed. Spangenberg. If this statement be true, Ennius was thirty years old when he learnt Greek: it seems however more likely that his knowledge of Greek induced him to bring Ennius to Rome. It is commonly stated (as by Niebuhr, Lect. vol. ii. p. 190) that Cato did not learn the Greek language until he was an old man.

(36) Ennius and Cato are associated by Horace as the authors of Latin composition in verse and prose:

'Cum lingua Catonis et Ennî
Sermonem patrium ditaverit, et nova rerum
Nomina protulerit.'—De Art. Poet. 56.

Sallust selected obsolete words from the writings of Cato, and introduced them into his own historical compositions, for which he was censured by the critics: see Suet. Oct. 86, De ill. Gramm. 15. In the first books of his Histories, he described Cato as the most eloquent Roman writer: 'Cato Romani generis disertissimus paucis absolvit.'—p. 3, ed. Kritz. In Brut. 17, Cicero says: 'Jam vero Origines ejus quem florem, aut quod lumen

Rome.(37) The second and third books seem likewise to have turned upon the legendary and ante-historical period of the Italian cities.(38)

§ 9 As to the historians who wrote in the next generation after Cato, and were about contemporary with the Gracchi—as Calpurnius Piso, Cassius Hemina, Sempronius Tuditanus, and Cn. Gellius—all of whom began their works from the foundation of the city, and continued the narrative to their own time—they could have had no access to any information respecting the early period, which was not open to their predecessors. So far as they relied on oral accounts, they were further removed from the times in question; and with regard to written memorials, either preserved in public archives, or by private families, the lapse of time had probably exercised some destructive influence. The same remark applies to Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias, only with increased force. They were somewhat posterior to the time of the Gracchi, and probably wrote about 100 B.C., more than a century after Fabius and Cincius. The work of the former began with the capture of Rome by the Gauls: that of the latter, with the building of the city. Their histories appear to have been carefully consulted by Livy, whom they preceded, as historians, by about a century.

§ 10 Dionysius, in treating of the foundation of Rome, says, that the Romans had no ancient historian; but that each

---

eloquentiæ non habent?' It is, however, difficult to reconcile the description of the style of the 'Origines' in this chapter, with that given in Orat. ii. 12, and Leg. i. 2, where Cato is treated as a mere dry annalist.

(37) See Krause, p. 98—106. Speaking of the date of the foundation of Rome, Dionysius says, i. 74: *Κάτων δὲ Πόρκιος Ἑλληνικὸν μὲν οὐχ ὁρίζει χρόνον· ἐπιμελὴς δὲ γενόμενος, εἰ καί τις ἄλλος, εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς ἀρχαιολογουμένης ἱστορίας, ἔτεσιν ἀποφαίνει δύσι καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ τετρακοσίοις ὑστεροῦσαν τῶν Ἰλιακῶν.*

(38) *οἱ δὲ λογιώτατοι τῶν Ῥωμαίων συγγραφέων, ἐν οἷς ἐστι Πόρκιός τε Κάτων ὁ τὰς γενεαλογίας τῶν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ πόλεων ἐπιμελέστατα συναγαγών, καὶ Γάϊος Σεμπρώνιος*, &c.—Dion. Hal. i. 11. Compare the *γενεηλογίαι* of Hecatæus, and the *κτίσεις* of many Greek writers. Cicero Tusc. Quæst. iv. 2, calls Cato a 'gravissimus auctor,' a witness of high authority, on a question of early Roman usages. As to the discrepancies of the writers of Italian origins, see Serv. Æn. vii. 678. De Italicis etiam urbibus Hyginus plenissime scripsit, et Cato in Originibus. Apud omnes tamen, si diligenter advertas, de auctoribus conditarum urbium dissensio invenitur, adeo ut ne urbis quidem Romæ origo possit diligenter [luculenter?] agnosci.

successive writer obtained some particulars from the stories preserved in sacred books, which he recorded in his history.(39) This statement (as we have seen) is quite consistent with the fact: for the earliest Roman historian wrote at a distance of more than 500 years from the foundation of the city; and was even divided by an interval of nearly 300 years from the expulsion of the kings and the establishment of the consular form of government.

Nevertheless, the classical writers sometimes use expressions which seem to imply that the early historians whom they quote were not only ancient with respect to their own age, but lived near the time for which their testimony is adduced. Thus Livy calls Fabius 'scriptorum antiquissimus,' in citing him as a witness to the statement that 80,000 men capable of bearing arms were enumerated in the census of Servius Tullius: and again, he describes the same historian as 'longe antiquissimus auctor,' in reference to the death of Coriolanus.(40) It is true, as a matter of fact, that Fabius was the most ancient of the Roman historians: nevertheless his antiquity falls short of the time assigned to the reign of Servius by about 3½ centuries; and when it is said that he is by far the most ancient witness with respect to the death of Coriolanus, it must not be overlooked that he was removed from that event by an interval of about 270 years.

The interval of time which separated Dionysius and Livy from Fabius was about the same as that which separates us from Selden:(41) if Selden had written the history of England, we might have considered his testimony, unsupported by documents, valid for any event in the seventeenth century: but we should not have admitted his evidence, without some ulterior authority, for a fact in the year 1370, in the reign of Edward III; still less for an event in the year 1290. Such writers as Piso and Sempronius, were to Dionysius and Livy, in point of time, nearly what Burnet and Carte are to us; while Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias stood to them in nearly the same relation in which Hume stands to a living historian of England.

---

(39) Speaking of the foundation of Rome, Dionysius says: Παλαιὸς μὲν οὖν οὔτε συγγραφεὺς οὔτε λογογράφος ἐστὶ Ῥωμαίων οὐδὲ εἷς· ἐκ παλαιῶν μέντοι λόγων ἐν ἱεραῖς δέλτοις σωζομένων ἕκαστός τι παραλαβὼν ἀνέγραψε.—i. 73. In xi. 62, he describes himself as πιστεύων ταῖς ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν τε καὶ ἀποθέτων βίβλων μαρτυρίαις.

(40) Livy, i. 44; ii. 40. Auctor means a witness.

(41) Selden died in 1654.

§ 11 The native historians of Rome, who were prior to Sallust, Dionysius, and Livy, have been sometimes grouped together, under the common designation of *annalists*.(42)

The Romans seem to have applied the word *annales* to any historical record arranged according to successive annual periods. Thus they spoke of the *Annales Pontificum*, the ancient register of memorable events, annually made by the pontiffs.(43) But the word was not confined to these meagre official annals: any historical work which was divided into annual periods, might be so designated. Thus Livy calls his own work *Annales*;(44) and Tacitus entitled his account of the times of Tiberius and the three next emperors *Annales;* while to his account of the emperors, of his own time, he gave the name of *Historiæ*.(45)

Annales was first used as a general term for history, written according to years, and lastly, for any history.(46) The law proposed by the tribune L. Villius, in the year 180 B.C., which defined the minimum age for the high offices of state, was denominated *Lex Annalis*, and the family of Villius acquired the cognomen of *Annalis*.(47)

---

(42) See Becker, vol. i. p. 37.

(43) See Becker, ib. p. 4. This is the meaning of the word annals, in Nieb. Hist. vol. i. p. 218—9. In Livy xliii. 13, the word *annales* appears to be used to denote public annals, kept by state officers.

(44) Livy, xliii. 13. In x. 18, Livy says: 'Literas ad collegam arcessendum ex Samnio missas, *in trinis annalibus* invenio:' where he means to say that he finds the fact stated in three histories.

(45) See Gell. v. 18; Niebuhr, in Phil. Mus. vol. ii. p. 661.

(46) In this sense, Virgil says:—

> 'O dea, si primâ repetens ab origine pergam,
> Et vacet *annales* nostrorum audire laborum.'—Æn. i. 372, 3.

Also Ovid:—

> 'Sacra recognosces *annalibus eruta priscis*,
> Et quo sit merito quæque notata dies.'—Fast. i. 7, 8.

This is the most common meaning of the word in the Latin writers.

(47) Eo anno rogatio primum lata est ab L. Villio tribuno plebis, quot annos nati quemque magistratum peterent caperentque. Inde cognomen

Hence, in passages where Cicero and other classical writers refer to *Annales*, with respect to events of the early period of Rome, they do not mean to cite either the official annals of the pontiffs, or the annalistic work of any early chronicler; but they use the word as synonymous with history in general.(48)

The class of historians now in question appear to have generally composed their works in an annalistic form: for Dionysius compares them with the Greek chronographers:(49) moreover, they are described by Cicero as writing in that jejune, concise, and unimpressive style which we consider as characteristic of the annalistic method.(50) Some of their works however were very voluminous—for example, that of Valerius Antias, of which the seventy-fifth book is quoted; and if their histories were extant, we probably should find that wide differences existed between them in ability, style, and method; so that it would be difficult to predicate anything of them in the aggregate. But it is material to observe that for the period before the landing of Pyrrhus, they were neither contemporary witnesses, nor had personal access to the evidence of contemporary witnesses; and that they continued to write during a period of nearly two centuries.

It is the more important for a reader to bear this circumstance in mind—because, in finding it stated in a modern critical historian, that Dionysius or Livy has taken such a fact from 'the Annalists,' or that he has misunderstood a legal or constitutional phrase used by 'the Annalists,' he may inadvertently be led to suppose that these annalists are understood to speak with the authority of contemporary witnesses, or with a knowledge of the

---

familiæ inditum ut *Annales* appellarentur. Livy, xl. 44. Concerning the *leges annales*, see Becker, ii. 2, p. 20; Wex in the Classical Museum, vol. iii. p. 405.

(48) See for example, Cic. Div. i. 17; De Fin. ii. 21; Florus, i. 10; which passages are erroneously applied by Leclerc, Des Journaux chez les Romains, p. 318, 351, 2, to the annals of the pontiffs. Lachmann, De Font. Liv. i. p. 29, understands Fabius to be referred to in the expression *prisci annales* in Livy, iv. 7, *vetustiores annales* in vii. 9, and *antiquissimi annales* in viii. 30.—'Ex annalium monumentis.' Gell. vii. 19.

(49) i. 7.

(50) Above, ch. 2, § 8.

technical political language of the day: whereas they were only annalists in the sense that a writer of the nineteenth century, who digests the history of Charlemagne according to years, is an annalist, and they may have lived four, five, six, seven, or even more centuries after the events which they recount.

Thus Niebuhr attempts to confirm a conjecture of his own, respecting the meaning of the term *ærarii*, and the introduction of the liability of the plebeians to tribute by saying that 'this was the view of those annalists, more accurately acquainted with the ancient times, whom Livy follows, when he relates how the tribunes of the people murmured that the tribute was only levied for the sake of ruining the Plebs.'(51) The passages in Livy refer to the year 398 B.C., eight years before the capture of the city by the Gauls—a time long anterior to the existence of contemporary annalists, if by annalists we are to understand historians.

Again, Niebuhr remarks that although Dionysius (erroneously, as he thinks) considers the clients as a part of the plebeian body, he distinguishes between them in his running narrative, 'because the genuine expressions, of *the Annals* were lying before him.'(52) These annals, however, if we are to understand the works of the annalistic historians, not the annals of the pontiffs, did not reflect the genuine language of the time, inasmuch as they were written many centuries afterwards.

He likewise speaks of the Annals containing much respecting the anti-popular conduct of Appius Claudius before the first secession of the Plebs, in 494 B.C., adding that this information was probably derived from the family memoirs of the Claudii:(53) a conjecture which shows that he is speaking, not of the official register, but of the work of some unauthorized historian. Yet there were no annalists who wrote the history of this period till the time of the Second Punic War. And afterwards he describes 'the Annals,' in relation to the same early period, as carefully copying the books of the augurs and pontiffs,(54) in which passage he clearly refers to some later historian, who, whatever may have been his time, was certainly long posterior to the events narrated, and could not, in describing them, have been assisted by any personal knowledge.(55)

---

(51) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 474, and p. 582, n. 1290. The passages of Livy are, v. 10, 12.

(52) Hist. vol. i. p. 590.

(53) Ib. p. 599.

---

(54) Ib. p. 608, n. 1344.

(55) See also ib. p. 572: 'Some annalist must have mentioned the evil,' p. 573.—'This remark clearly belongs to an old annalist, not to Livy, p. 573. 'Livy himself, in spite of his prejudices, does not suppress what was to be read in the annals,' ib. 'The annals related that the persons who seceded on account of their debts, were in the legions,' ib. p. 580.

In vol. ii. p. 50, 1, in treating of the Latin league, he speaks of 'a Latin Annalist,' followed by Dionysius, and he suspects that this annalist 'had retained the old law term, which the Greek historian could not understand.'—Ib. p. 180: 'The express information that the elections were transferred from the centuries to the curies, he himself [Dionysius] gives us in the person of the tribune Lætorius, as it had been put into his mouth by some Roman annalist.'—Ib. p. 203, n. 459: 'Perhaps, however, it was merely some careful annalist that mentioned,' &c.—Ib. p. 210: with respect to the assassination of Genucius; 'On this point Livy, whose prejudices certainly did not incline him to suspect patricians unjustly, must have found the annals all agreed in their testimony.'—

In treating of the decemviral period, he says: ib. p. 323, 'This was distinctly perceived by the authors whom Dionysius had before him, when he wrote, that after the first year, the prospect of getting rid of the tribuneship determined the senators to wish for the decemvirate; and assuredly all the annalists saw with equal clearness that half of the second decemviral board did actually consist of plebeians.'

Again, p. 324: 'Livy, whose contradictions proceed from his following different annalists in different passages, begins his account of the decemvirate,' &c.

In vol. iii. p. 13, n. 12, a case is described where the annalists filled up a meagre account with the matter of a later age. Here a subsequent historian, not a contemporary official registrar, is clearly meant.

Ib. p. 30: He speaks of what the old annalists perhaps related unanimously respecting the Licinian rogations.

Ib. p. 116: 'The arbitrary view of an annalist' is mentioned. Many other passages of the same sort occur throughout Niebuhr's work.

It should be observed that in all these cases, the mention of the 'annals' or 'annalists' is exclusively due to Niebuhr's conjecture. In none of these cases, does Livy or Dionysius, or any other writer, refer to any annals.

Eodem anno descisse Antiates apud plerosque auctores invenio. L. Cornelium consulem id bellum gessisse, oppidumque cepisse, certum affirmare, quia nulla apud vetustiores scriptores ejus rei mentio est, non ausim. Livy iii. 23, with respect to the year 459 B.C. Who the *vetustiores scriptores* alluded to by Livy may be, we know not; but we may be sure that he means no writer older than Fabius and Cincius. Niebuhr, however, Hist. vol. ii. n. 567 and 579, renders this expression by 'older annals' and 'earlier annalists.'

In vol. ii. p. 2, Niebuhr says that Claudius Quadrigarius 'was one of the annalists whom Livy had before him.' Here the word annalist is applied to a comparatively recent historian: for Claudius Quadrigarius was posterior to the time of the Gracchi.

Elsewhere he makes a distinction between an early set of annals, which was deserving of credit, and was written with an accurate knowledge of the character of the times, and a later set, which was of inferior authority, and did not possess the same title to belief.(56) This distinction however rests on no historical ground — the earliest and latest annalists were, though not equally remote from the first centuries of the city, yet so remote as to be equally beyond the reach of all direct and personal knowledge either of the events or the institutions.

§ 12 So far as the Roman history of the first four and a-half centuries rested on the accounts of native writers, it was compiled by Livy and Dionysius from the works of the historians, beginning with Fabius Pictor and Cincius, who lived before their time. From these the received version of that history was doubtless almost exclusively taken. We learn however from Dionysius that certain Greek writers treated the early Roman history; at the head of whom he places Hieronymus of Cardia, the historian of the successors of Alexander, and Timæus the Sicilian, who related the early events in his general history, and included the war with Pyrrhus in a separate work upon that prince. After these he mentions Antigonus, Polybius, Silenus, and numerous others who wrote on various parts of the history. But each of them, he adds, treated the subjects briefly, and without diligence or accuracy, deriving his information only from casual reports.(57) The latter description does not apply to the accounts of Roman affairs given by Polybius; and Silenus, though he may not have been a judicious historian, nevertheless must have had great opportunities, in Hannibal's camp, of learning the truth with respect to the events of the war with Rome. Of Antigonus we know scarcely anything:(58) from the order in which his name is placed by Dionysius, he appears to be later than Timæus and earlier than Polybius: which would make him about contemporary with Fabius and Cincius. The remark of Dionysius seems to apply principally to the accounts of the early Roman history, introduced into their histories by Hieronymus and Timæus. Hieronymus, in his relation of the wars of Pyrrhus, and Timæus in his General History, which came down to 264 B.C., the commencement of the First Punic War, and in his work on Pyrrhus, had both occasion to speak of Rome with reference to contemporary events; and hence they doubtless introduced incidentally a sketch of its early history. There is no reason to suppose that Hieronymus ever visited Italy or Sicily. Timæus, who was a native of Tauromenium, in Sicily, was banished by Agathocles, and passed fifty years at Athens; but appears to have returned to Sicily in his old age, and to have there completed his histories.(59) The knowledge of Italy and Sicily possessed by the Greeks underwent a considerable extension in the age of the successors of Alexander. The collection of marvellous stories, which is attributed to Aristotle, but belongs to this period, contains many minute particulars respecting these countries.(60) The principal channel through which these accounts reached the Greeks of the mother country was doubtless the information of merchants and other navigators.(61) It must have been from information of this kind that

---

(56) See Hist. vol. ii. p. 249—264; vol. iii. p. 117. In vol. ii. p. 298, n. 676, the original relation contained in 'the old annals,' and a subsequent addition to it are mentioned.

(57) *ὧν ἕκαστος ὀλίγα, καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὰ διεσπουδασμένως οὐδὲ ἀκριβῶς, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων ἀκουσμάτων συνθεὶς, ἀνέγραψεν.*—i. 6.

(58) See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 305.

---

(59) Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. i. præf. p. l.

(60) Thus mention is made of Daunia, c. 109; Peucetia, c. 110; Iapygia, c. 97-8; Tarentum, c. 32, 106; Metapontum, c. 108; Thurii, c. 169; Sicily, c. 40, 55-7, 82, 112, 130, 148, 172; Ætna, c. 154; Pelorus, c. 111; Lipara, c. 34, 37, 101; Cumæ, c. 95, 102; the Sirenussæ, c. 103; Circæum, c. 78; Œnaria in Tuscany, c. 94; Elba, c. 93, 105; Sardinia, c. 100; the Umbri, c. 80; a Heraclean road in Italy, leading to Celtica and Iberia, is mentioned in c. 85. Westermann, in the preface to his Paradoxographi, p. xxvi, says of it: 'Paucissima sunt quæ ætatem Aristotelis aperte migrant, nisi huc referre vis partem eorum quæ de Italiâ atque adjacentibus regionibus passim proferuntur, quæque sane ætatem aliquanto inferiorem sapere videntur.' The mention of Agathocles, c. 110, and of Cleonymus, c. 78, brings down the composition of the treatise to a date posterior to Aristotle. See above, p. 58.

(61) Livy describes the Romans in early times as relying upon the information of travelling merchants, even in affairs of state: 'Itaque quum

Aristotle compiled the description of the Carthaginian constitution, which we read in the second book of his Politics; as well as the descriptions of the constitutions of other non-Grecian states, which he included in his lost collection of Constitutions. The oral reports thus obtained were doubtless not very trustworthy, even with respect to visible and contemporary phenomena, as we may learn from the Aristotelian collection of marvellous stories; but with respect to the past, they were still less likely to be veracious. Such however were probably the authorities followed by Hieronymus and Timæus in their accounts of early Roman history. The work of Diocles of Peparethus, who is stated by Plutarch to have first given to the world the celebrated foundation legend of Romulus and Remus, and to have been followed in it by Fabius Pictor, appears not to have been known to Dionysius, who never makes mention of it. We shall revert hereafter to this subject, in connexion with the accounts of the foundation of Rome.(62)

§ 13 The existence of Greek histories in which the war with Pyrrhus and the First Punic War were related, and in which Roman affairs were otherwise adverted to, could not fail to be known to many Romans at the time of the Second Punic War. Historiography was at that time exclusively a Greek art; and it is not unnatural that the earliest Roman histories should have been composed in the Greek language. The authors of them were, moreover, men engaged in civil and military affairs. The Roman history had from its origin the character of memoirs, composed by persons who had borne a part in public life, and who wrote with the practical view of throwing light upon the political state of their country. They did not belong to the

---

renunciatum a mercatoribus esset negata Veientibus auxilia.' iv. 24. 'Hinc Etruriæ principum ex omnibus populis conjurationem de bello, ad fanum Voltumnæ factam, mercatores afferebant.' vi. 2. Cæsar censures the Gauls for the same practice, B. G. iv. 5. But he describes himself as obtaining information respecting Britain from merchants, because they were almost the only persons who went from Gaul to that island.—ib. iv. 20. They likewise convey to Britain the news of his intended expedition.—c. 21.

(62) Below, ch. 10, § 6, 9.

literary class, and they did not cultivate history as an art; but they compiled the memoirs of their own times in the dry and unadorned style which was used for the composition of the public annals by the chief pontiff;(63) while with respect to the times beyond the memory of the living generation, they derived their accounts from entries preserved in national and sacred repositories.(64) Hence the Roman historiography had, from its commencement, an official and public character; it was composed by statesmen and soldiers, either from their own personal knowledge, or from public documents and records. Greek history, on the other hand, originated, to a great extent, with private and unauthorized writers, who had not a distinctly conceived practical end, but who aimed rather at producing a work of art, or at least a pleasing narrative, and who sought to acquire a literary reputation. Their object, if not to win a prize for their composition, was to obtain the admiration of an attentive audience. Even if the stories of the recitations of Herodotus at Olympia and elsewhere are all false,(65) the practice which they imply was doubtless real. Thucydides, indeed, as well as Philistus and Xenophon, belong to the same class of writers as the early Roman historians; but the former contrasts his own history, as a work designed for permanence, with those histories which were intended merely to gain momentary applause, or to make an exhibition of literary talent.(66) The work of Thucydides combined a practical with a philosophical character; those of the early Roman historians had the former without the latter.

---

(63) 'Erat enim historia,' (says Cicero, of the early Roman historians) nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio;' and he proceeds to illustrate the sense which he attaches to the word *annales*, by a reference to the annals kept by the Pontifex Maximus. He then adds: 'Hanc similitudinem scribendi multi secuti sunt, qui sine ullis ornamentis monumenta solum temporum, hominum, locorum, gestarumque rerum reliquerunt.'—Cicer. de Orat. ii. 12. A comparison of the extract from Calpurnius Piso (above, p. 30) in Gell. vi. 9, with Livy, ix. 46, will illustrate the difference between the bald and unattractive style of the ancient historians, and that of the polished writers of the Augustan age.

(64) Dion. Hal. above, p. 89, n. 39.

(65) See Mure's Hist. of Gr. Lit. vol. iv. p. 254–70.

(66) ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παράχρημα.—i. 22.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE ORAL TRADITIONS OF ROMAN HISTORY, FOR THE PERIOD BEFORE THE WAR WITH PYRRHUS.

§ 1 WE have already seen that Polybius lays down the principle, that a historian can only obtain accurate information respecting the events of the past time, by restricting himself to such facts as can be described to him by persons of the preceding generation who had immediate knowledge of them; and that in applying this principle, he commences his consecutive history only about twenty years before his own birth. The infidelity of oral tradition, with respect to past occurrences, has been so generally recognised, that it would be a superfluous labour to dwell upon it. For our present purpose, it is more material to fix the time during which an accurate memory of historical events may be perpetuated by oral tradition alone. Newton, in his work on Chronology,(1) fixes it at eighty or a hundred years for a time anterior to the use of writing: and Volney says that, among the Red Indians of North America, there was no accurate tradition of facts which were a century old.(2) Mallet, in his work on Northern Antiquities, remarks that, among the common class of mankind, a son remembers his father, knows something about his grandfather, but never bestows a thought on his more remote progenitors.(3) This would carry back a man's knowledge of his own family for about a hundred years; and it is not likely that his knowledge of public affairs, founded on a similar oral tradition, would reach to an earlier date.

---

(1) The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms amended (1728, 4to), Introd. p. 7.

(2) See the author's Treatise on Obs. and Reas. in Pol. vol. i. p. 318; and other passages, ib.

(3) c. 2. See ib. vol. i. p. 218. M. Leclerc, Des Journaux chez les Romains, p. 11. says, that the memory of old men, or traditions, always goes back at least a hundred years. In some places Niebuhr appears to rely upon the fidelity of oral tradition for long periods of time. Thus, in

We learn from Thucydides, that the Athenians, during the panic fear caused by the mutilation of the Mercuries, and the dread of treasonable attempts to overthrow the democracy and establish a despotism, recurred in their thoughts to the government of Pisistratus and his sons, which had begun nearly 150 years and ended nearly 100 years before that time, and which they knew only from oral tradition.(4) The Athenians, in the Peloponnesian war, like the Romans in the Second Punic War, possessed no history of their country; the imperfect narratives of the Pisistratic period, incidentally introduced by Herodotus and Thucydides in their histories, were not published till afterwards. Yet there was a sufficient knowledge of the history of the Pisistratic despotism generally diffused among the Athenians at this time to increase the popular sentiment of alarm, and to furnish a ground of inference, from a native precedent, as to the probable acts of a despot, in case any aspiring oligarch should be able to possess himself of supreme power, and subject the citizens to his sway. It is true that this popular belief was erroneous as to some material facts; but it was sufficiently accurate in substance to guide the Athenians in their political

---

Hist. vol. i. p. 230, he states, that 'genuine and oral tradition has kept the story of Tarpeia *for five-and-twenty hundred years* in the mouths of the common people, who for many centuries have been total strangers to the names of Clœlia and Cornelia.' In vol. ii. p. 77, he says: 'The right of intermarriage with Alba is expressed in the legend of the mothers of the Horatii and Curiatii; that with the Priscans and Latins, in the story of the matrons who, before the battle of Regillus, were allowed to part from their husbands; *and on such matters tradition cannot deviate from the truth.*' With respect to the story of the contempt of Papirius for the auspices, in Livy, x. 40, he remarks: 'Such traces before the existence of a history written by contemporaries, are far more historical than anything else: *they continue to live for centuries handed down by tradition.*' Hist. vol. iii. p. 393.

(4) *ἀκοῇ*. See Thuc. vi. 53—60; compare i. 18—20. The despotism of Pisistratus began in 560 B.C. The expulsion of the family took place in 510 B.C. The affair of the Mercuries was in 415 B.C.

reasonings, and it unquestionably influenced their practical judgment. There is no ground for believing that the Roman public in 218 B.C. were not as well informed respecting their political history, as the Athenian public had been, respecting their own history, two centuries earlier. The contemporaries of Fabius Maximus and Scipio were doubtless as inquisitive respecting the events of their native history as the contemporaries of Nicias and Alcibiades. Adopting this example as a standard of measurement, we may assume that the Romans, at the beginning of the Second Punic War, would have preserved an oral tradition, correct in its general substance, though erroneous in many single facts, for a period reaching back for nearly 150 years; that is to say, till nearly twenty years within the capture of Rome by the Gauls.(5)

The expulsion of the Pisistratidæ preceded the death of Thucydides by thirty-nine years. The inquiries therefore which he instituted into the circumstances of that event, and the attempt of Harmodius and Aristogiton, may be considered as limited within fifty years before his own lifetime. The corresponding period in Rome, with respect to Fabius, would bring us to about the year 300 B.C., just before the commencement of the Third Samnite War.

The Lacedæmonians and Athenians are described by Thucydides as referring in their public acts, in the year 432 B.C., to an event of Athenian history—the attempt of Cylon—which took place about 612 B.C.(6) This event was therefore, at this time, 180 years old; and its memory could only have been preserved by oral tradition. If we adopt this example as a canon of computation, we must enlarge the period of exact traditionary memory; and we shall, on applying it to Roman history, find that the Romans, at the beginning of the Second Punic War, might have retained an oral record of an event even so remote as the siege of Veii, the commencement of which is placed 187 years, and its termination 178 years, before the year 218 B.C.

---

(5) Livy quotes the testimony of Fabius to a fact of the year 325 B.C. viii. 30.

(6) i. 126.

If we suppose that Herodotus and Thucydides were able to obtain accurate oral accounts respecting the attempt of Cylon, we must allow that they could ascend to dates, the former 182 years, and the latter 141 years, before their respective births. Taking the latter number, we should obtain for Fabius a period reaching back as far as the close of the siege of Veii.

§ 2 In a nation which has no consecutive written history, leading events would be perhaps preserved, in their general outlines, for about a hundred years. Special circumstances might however give to an event a longer hold on the popular memory. Thus the attempt of Cylon, already adverted to, created a hereditary curse in the powerful family of the Alcmæonidæ at Athens, which would naturally tend to keep up the recollection of the event out of which it had grown. Moreover, these recollections were refreshed by the act of Cleomenes, the Spartan king, who, in 510 B.C., about a century after the occurrence, expelled some of the tainted persons from Athens; and after another interval of eighty years, in 432, the subject was revived by Sparta, for the purpose of procuring the removal of Pericles, who was, by descent, included within the curse.

Some of the events of the earlier Roman history might in this manner have been accurately preserved for a period exceeding a century, at the beginning of the Second Punic War. Thus commemorative festivals, and other periodical observances, may in certain cases have served to perpetuate a true tradition of some national event.(7) Most of the Roman festivals, indeed, appear to be traced to fabulous origins: but for many of the periodical ceremonies and usages which were observed by the Romans at the end of the third century B.C., a knowledge of the true historical origin was probably still alive. Thus the memory of the *Dies Alliensis*, the anniversary of the fatal battle of Allia, had doubtless been preserved by an uninterrupted usage since the year 390 B.C., in which the disaster took place.(8) As the memory of this great reverse was painful and humiliating to the Romans, it would not have been perpetuated by an anniversary, and thus kept alive by a periodical celebration, if it had not been founded on truth. We may compare with it the service for the execution of Charles I., appointed under the Restoration.

---

(7) For a list of Roman festivals, see Hartung, Religion der Römer, vol. i. p. 154.

§ 3 In like manner, the existence of a series of elective kings; their expulsion in consequence of some abuse of power;(9) and their replacement by the existing institution of two annual elective consuls, were facts likely to be deeply engraven in the popular memory. The interrex, who continued to be appointed till the end of the Republic, during the vacancies of consuls, for the purpose of conducting the election of their successor, was a long-enduring reminiscence of the regal period;(10) inasmuch as it was believed that this officer originated at the time when the institution of elective kings was in force—to whom the maxim of an hereditary royalty, that 'the king never dies,'(11) did not apply; and that when the important and invidious office of king had been abolished, the unimportant and inoffensive office and title of interrex had been retained.

---

(8) Concerning the Dies Alliensis, and its observance as an unlucky day in later times, see below, ch. xii.

Ovid alludes to the Dies Alliensis as an unlucky day:

> Tu licet incipias quâ flebilis Allia luce
> Vulneribus Latiis sanguinolenta fuit,
> Quâque die redeunt, rebus minus apta gerendis,
> Culta Palæstino septima festa Syro.
> Art. Amand. i. 413—6.

In the battle with the Prænestines on the Allia, 380 B.C., ten years after the Gallic invasion, the fatal conflict with the Gauls is described as having been remembered on both sides. Livy, vi. 28, 9.

Livy represents the consul Cn. Manlius, in his address to his soldiers, in 189 B.C., before the battle against the Gauls in Asia Minor, to have alluded to the defeat on the Allia; xxxviii. 17. The time is exactly two centuries—as Manlius says—just the same time as the Protectorate is from us.

(9) The *Regifugium*, or anniversary of the expulsion of the kings, was celebrated on the 24th of February.

> Nunc mihi dicenda est regis fuga: Traxit ab illâ
> Sextus ab extremo nomina mense dies.
> Ovid, Fast. ii. 683, 4.

Regifugium sacrum dicebant, quo die rex Tarquinius fugerit e Româ. Festus, p. 279. Compare Schwegler, R. G., vol. i. p. 779.

(10) If the Comitia for appointing new consuls could not be held by a dictator, or one of the outgoing consuls, an interrex was appointed by the patricians, i. e., practically by the Senate—and the interrex himself was

The insignia of high office used by the dictator, consuls, and prætors—namely, the lictors with the fasces, the ivory curule chair, and the purple-edged toga prætexta—were likewise believed to be relics of the ancient royal state, and to have been transferred to the republican officers from the kings, when the Tarquins were expelled, and the form of government was altered.(12)

---

always a patrician. An interrex was appointed for five days. Appian, B.C. i. 98. Compare Livy, i. 17. Dion. Hal., ii. 57; cf. viii. 90, concerning the original institution; also Eutrop. i. 4. If the election was not completed within that time, another interrex was appointed, and so on in succession—as many as 8, 11 and 14 interreges were thus sometimes successively appointed. See Becker, ii. 1, p. 299—309; below, ch. xi., § 10.

This institution was doubtless intended to guard against an usurpation of power in the interrex, by confining the duration of his office within very narrow limits. The function of the interrex seems to have been, to propose the rogatio, or motion for the election, to the Comitia. (Dion. ix. 14.) According to the Roman practice, the motion was made, and the question was put, by the same person. See Becker, ii. 3, p. 93, 4. The ancients seem to have had no person like our Speaker, to act as the president or chairman of their deliberative assemblies. This office is of modern, and apparently of English origin. It is of great importance in a popular assembly that there should be a person specially appointed to preserve order, and to maintain the rules of its procedure. It is likewise very convenient that the person who puts the question should be distinct from the person who makes the motion.

(11) Compare the French expression of this rule of succession, 'Le roi est mort: vive le roi!' See Blackstone, Com. i. 249.

Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 340, says, that with the exception of the year 701 U.C., no interrex had been appointed in the last three centuries of the Republic. (Becker, ii. 1, p. 296, takes a similar view.) But an interrex was appointed in 672 U.C.=82, in order to create Sylla dictator: Appian, B.C. i. 98; Cic. Leg. i. 15. Appian describes the custom as having existed uninterruptedly up to the time of Sylla. See likewise the expression of Livy, i. 17: Id ab re, *quod nunc quoque tenet nomen*, interregnum appellatum.

(12) The kings, by the institution of Romulus, had twelve lictors, the sella curulis, and the toga prætexta; Livy, i. 8; Plut. Rom. 26. Dion. Hal. iii. 61, says that Tarquinius Priscus borrowed from Etruria the royal insignia—viz. 1, a gold crown; 2, an ivory chair; 3, a staff with an eagle at its head; 4, a purple chiton, or close garment, with gold ornaments; 5, a variegated semicircular purple toga; 6, the twelve fasces. Others however said that the twelve fasces were introduced by Romulus:

The fasces were a significant emblem of supreme power; an axe, for decapitation, was tied in a bundle of sticks, with which the criminal was beaten before execution. The consuls appear at an early period to have removed the axe from the fasces, when they moved about the city, and only to have introduced this symbol of the power of life and death when they left Rome, and assumed the unlimited military imperium. This innovation is attributed to Valerius,(13) who is likewise described as having lowered his fasces to the people, in token of his submission to their supreme power.(14) On the other hand, the Decemvirs are represented to have restored the royal practice; and to have gone about the city, each preceded by twelve lictors, bearing the complete fasces with the axe; by which means they created a fear that the regal power, as well as the regal emblems, would be revived.(15)

Dionysius, c. 62, adds that all these insignia were transferred to the consuls—except the crown and the variegated dress, which were used only in triumphs. The same statement is repeated in detail, in iv. 74. Compare x. 24. Livy says generally: 'Omnia jura, omnia insignia primi consules tenuere. Id modo cautum est, ne, si ambo fasces haberent, duplicatus terror videretur.' ii. 1. The detailed account of Dionysius has no historical value. It is evidently a mere explanatory legend; nor can any great reliance be placed on his account of the Decemvirs. But these passages taken together prove the existence of an early belief that the insignia of high office ascended to the royal period. The Ædiles were permitted by the Senate to use the prætexta and the ivory chair, and the other insignia which the kings had borne. Dion. Hal. vi. 95. On the insignia of magistrates, see Becker, ii. 2, p. 77; of the consuls, ib. p. 108; of the kings, ii. 1, 336. On the triumphal costume, see Polyb. vi. 53; Dion. Hal. v. 47.

(13) See Dion. Hal. v. 19; x. 59; Cic. Rep. ii. 31. Dionysius says that the practice of not carrying the axe in the city remained until his own time: ὃ καὶ μέχρι τῆς ἐμῆς διέμεινεν ἡλικίας.—v. 29. Dionysius, v. 2, states that the original practice was, that each consul exhibited the axes for alternate months: the other consul having the fasces borne before him without the axes: and that this was done in order that the consuls should use only the same number of axes as had been used by the king, and that the people might not say that there were two kings instead of one.

(14) Below, ch. xii.

(15) Dion. x. 59, 60. The dictator had twenty-four lictors and fasces, equal to the aggregate number used by the two consuls, and double the number attributed to the king. See Polyb. iii. 87; Dion. Hal. x. 24, (Becker, ii. 2, p. 174.) The prætor had only six lictors, half the consular number. Hence he is called by Polybius ἑξαπέλεκυς στρατηγός. See Becker, ii. 2, p. 188. Appian says, that the king, like the dictator, had twenty-four lictors and fasces.—B. C. i. 100. This, and the other account of the number twelve for the kings, are equally guesses.

Whatever historical value may belong to the statements respecting the changes made in the use of the fasces, by Valerius and the Decemvirs, it cannot be doubted that the belief in the derivation of the consular insignia from the kings, ascended to a very early period.

The existence, up to a late date, of a sacerdotal officer, entitled the *King of the Sacrifices*,(16) is a more decisive indication of a reminiscence from the regal period, because, as in the case of the *interrex*, the very name of king was preserved. The king of the sacrifices was a high religious functionary, whose office lasted for life, and there were certain sacrifices which he alone was authorized to perform. These sacrifices could, as it was believed, under the royal government, be performed only by the king, who, like the Greek heroic king, was chief priest, as well as chief civil governor.(17) His political insignificance was, however, secured by his disqualification from holding any civil office, which was not the case with any other pontifical functionary.(18) His wife was called *Regina*, and she likewise performed certain sacrifices, which were said to have been previously performed by the king's consort.(19) Similar relics of the kingly office existed in Greece. Aristotle says that, partly from the abandonment of their powers, and partly by the encroachments of the people, the kings, in most Greek states, only retained the right of offering sacrifices.(20) Athens, in particular, presented a perfect parallel to Rome, with respect to this singular institution: for there the

---

(16) Rex sacrorum—Rex sacrificiorum—Rex sacrificus—Rex sacrificulus. Concerning his office, see Dion. Hal. iv. 74, v. i. Manius Papirius is stated by Dionysius to have first held the office.

(17) Rerum deinde divinarum habita cura, et quia quædam publica sacra per ipsos reges factitata erant, ne ubiubi regum desiderium esset, regem sacrificulum creant. Id sacerdotium pontifici subjecere, ne additus nomini honos aliquid libertati, cujus tunc prima erat cura, officeret. Livy, ii. 2. Compare Becker, ii. 2, p. 6; Hartung, vol. i. p. 159.

(18) Plut. Quæst. Rom. c. 63. Livy, xl. 42, gives an actual case illustrative of this disqualification.

(19) Macrob. Sat. i. 15.

(20) Pol. iii. 14, cf. vi. 18. When the revolted city of Anagnia was reduced by the Romans in 306 B.C., the magistrates were deprived of all civil power, but were allowed to retain their religious functions, Livy, ix. 43.

Archon Basileus performed certain state-sacrifices, and his wife was called *Basilissa*.(21)

The ancient law in force at Rome, by which any person who attempted to establish the royal power, was liable to capital punishment, with forfeiture of goods, may probably be considered as a reminiscence of the time when kings existed, and of the feeling of repugnance with which their memory was regarded;(22) similar to the laws against τυραννὶς, or despotism, at Athens.(23) Sp. Cassius, Mælius, and Manlius, successively lost their lives for attempts to make themselves kings.(24) The tumult which ended in the slaughter of Tib. Gracchus, began, according to Plutarch, by a gesture of Gracchus, who pointed to his own head. This was misinterpreted by his opponents into a demand for a diadem, and led to the fatal attack on his person.(25) The ill-will which Cæsar drew upon himself by his encouragement of the attempts to invest him with the dignity of king, is well-known;(26) and its importance in contributing to the conspiracy for murdering him, is attested by the scrupulous anxiety with which Augustus avoided the assumption of the royal honours, title, or insignia.(27) The idea that a king was an absolute monarch, which prevailed throughout the later ages of Rome, was probably in part derived from the belief respecting the character of the last Tarquin's rule, though it is inconsistent with their own history of their other kings. The Greek kings of the Macedonian period, and the barbarian kings, with whom the Romans came in contact, were however all absolute; and it was from them that the later Roman idea of royalty was practically taken.

---

(21) Pollux, viii. 90. Speaking of the Nones, Varro says: 'Eodem die in urbem ab agris ad regem conveniebat populus. Harum rerum vestigia in sacris Nonalibus in arce, quod tunc ferias primas menstruas quæ futuræ sint eo mense, rex edicit populo.' De L. L. vi. 28. Compare Dion. Hal. vii. 58; Macrob. i. 16. It appears that the Rex sacrorum had an official house, which Augustus gave to the Vestal Virgins. Dio Cass. liv. 27. See Becker, vol. i. p. 227. It has been conjectured that this house had originally been royal property.—ib. p. 239.

(22) Brutus is said to have caused the people to take an oath against the restoration of royal government: Livy, ii. 1, who attributes the law against kings to Valerius, ib. 8. Compare Dion. Hal. v. 19; Plut. Publ. 12.

(23) The decree against Philip, king of Macedon, passed by the Athenians in 200 B.C., contained at the end a clause: 'Ut omnia quæ adversus Pisistratidas decreta quondam erant, eadem in Philippo servarentur.'—Livy, xxxi. 44.

(24) Below, ch. 12 and 13. Some Claudius Drusus is stated to have once aimed at royalty: 'Claudius Drusus, statuâ sibi cum diademate ad Appii Forum positâ, Italiam per clientelas occupare tentavit.' Suet. Tib. 2. There seems no ground for identifying him with Claudius Pulcher, the son of Appius the Blind, who was consul in 249 B.C. See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 171; Drumann, vol. ii. p. 176.

(25) Plut. Tib. Gracch. 19.

(26) See Sueton. Cæsar, 79, 80. The following pasquinade was affixed at the time to Cæsar's statue:—'Brutus, quia reges ejecit, consul primus factus est. Hic, quia consules ejecit, rex postremo factus est.' See Niebuhr, Lect. vol. iii. p. 78. Cicero defends himself against a charge of

There were likewise in the Capitol ancient statues of the seven kings; and in the midst of them, a brazen statue of Junius Brutus, holding a drawn sword.(28) A statue of Julius Cæsar was placed near these eight statues in the year 708 U.C., 46 B.C., two years before his assassination,(29) with the covert object of giving him kingly honours.

An ancient statue of Servius Tullius was also preserved at Rome, to which a marvellous legend was attached. 'Another supernatural occurrence,' says Dionysius, 'proves that this prince was beloved by the gods; a belief which gave rise to the fabulous and incredible story concerning his birth, already mentioned. In the Temple of Fortune, erected by himself, a gilt wooden image alone remained uninjured during a conflagration, while everything else in the temple was destroyed by the fire. It

---

having acted like a king during his consulship, in his speech pro Sulla, c. 7—10. 'After the expulsion of the kings, (says Gibbon,) the ambitious Roman who should dare to assume their title or imitate their tyranny, was devoted to the infernal gods; each of his fellow-citizens was armed with a sword of justice; and the act of Brutus, however repugnant to gratitude or prudence, had been already sanctified by the judgment of his country.'—Decl. and Fall, c. 44; and he points out that Suetonius under the empire could venture to say that his homicide was considered as justified by law. Cæsar, 76. Compare Cic. Phil. ii. 34, where it is said that all admit Cæsar to have been 'jure interfectus.'

(27) Compare Suet. Oct. 51-3.

(28) Plut. Brut. i.; Plin. N. H. xxxiii. 4; xxxiv. 11; Appian, B.C. i. 16. Concerning the statue of Brutus, see Dio Cass. xliv. 12; Sueton. Cæsar, 80. 'Republican Rome (says Niebuhr) never stripped herself of the recollection of her kings, any more than she removed their statues from the Capitol; in the best times of her freedom their memory was revered and celebrated.' —Hist. vol. i. p. 255.

(29) Dio Cass. xliii. 45; Suet. Cæsar, 76.

may be now seen that the temple, and all the restorations made in it after the fire, are of modern workmanship; but the statue retains its antique character unchanged, and is still venerated by the Romans.'(30) The same account of this conflagration is given by Ovid in his Fasti; who says, that Vulcan, as being the father of Servius, prevented the fire from destroying his image.(31) A statue of Tanaquil, the wife of Tarquinius Priscus, was also shown in the Temple of Sancus.(32)

When these statues were erected we are ignorant: the statues of the seven kings and of Brutus may resemble the pictures at Holyrood House, while the statue of Servius in the Temple of Fortune, and the image of Tanaquil, may be like some of the ancient figures of the Virgin, or saints, in the continental churches, to which legendary origins are attached. They may however be taken as evidence of the existence of a belief in the received history of the kings, ascending up to an early period.

The notice in Livy that the Curule Ædiles erected a statue of Romulus and Remus with the wolf in the year 295 B.C., may be considered as authentic,(33) and it is not improbable that the statue which they erected is that now extant at Rome.(34) At this time, therefore, the legend respecting the foundation of the city had assumed the form in which it was afterwards received, and in which it was nearly a century later fixed in writing by Fabius.

---

(30) iv. 40. The fable respecting the generation of Servius, is related above, c. 2. Dionysius disbelieves this story: but he believes that the statue was preserved supernaturally by the power of the gods. As to miracles concerning statues, see Plut. Camill. 6, Coriol. 38.

(31) Fast. vi. 612—28. The following couplet refers to Servius, although he was the sixth king:—

'Sitque caput semper Romano tectus amictu,
Qui rex in nostrâ septimus urbe fuit.'—v. 617, 8.

One manuscript reads: 'Qui rex Romanâ sextus in urbe fuit.'

(32) Plin. N. H. viii. 74; Plut. Quæst. Rom. 30. Compare Festus, p. 238: 'Præbia rursus Verrius vocari ait ea remedia, quæ Gaia Cæcilia uxor Tarquini Prisci invenisse existimatur, et immiscuisse zonæ suæ, quâ præcincta statua ejus est in æde Sanci, qui deus Dius Fidius vocatur, ex quâ zonâ periclitantes ramenta sumunt. Ea vocari ait præbia, quod mala prohibeant.' See also Festus in Gaia Cæcilia, p. 95. Concerning Tanaquil or Gaia Cæcilia, see Hartung, Rel. der Römer, vol. i. p. 90-2, 316-8.

(33) x. 23.

(34) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 424; Becker, vol. i. p. 293. Cicero, in his third Oration against Catiline, c. 8, speaks of a gilt statue of the wolf and twins in the Capitol, which had been struck by lightning in the consulship of Cotta and Torquatus (65 B.C.): 'Tactus est etiam ille, qui hanc urbem condidit, Romulus; quem inauratum in Capitolio parvum atque lactentem, uberibus lupinis inhiantem fuisse meministis.

There were, also, numerous buildings, monuments, and public places at Rome, with which reminiscences of the kings or of the regal period were associated. Thus the Ruminal figtree, under which Romulus and Remus were supposed to have been suckled by the wolf, was shown at Rome even during the Empire.(35) The cave of the Lupercal was also derived from the wolf of Romulus.(36) The hut of Romulus was, with its straw roof, religiously preserved, as a sacred relic, on the Capitol or Palatine hill:(37) the boundaries of the pomerium of Romulus, as it was enlarged by his colleague, T. Tatius, are accurately traced by Tacitus.(38) The augural crook of Romulus was said to have been preserved unhurt in the Gallic conflagration, like the statue of King Servius, and to have been extant in later times.(39) The *Sacra Via* was believed to have derived its name from being the place where the holy alliance between Romulus and Tatius was concluded; it contained the statues of the two kings.(40) The Tarpeian rock was supposed to owe its name to the traitress Tarpeia.(41) The *Vallis Egeriæ* was the place where Numa was reported to have met the nymph who deigned to hold converse with him.(42) The Curia Hostilia, long the place of meeting for the Senate, was said to have been founded by Tullus Hostilius, after the destruction of Alba.(43) Various monuments of the battle between the Horatii and the Curiatii—the Pila Horatia, the Sororium Tigillum, and the tombs of the three brothers—were exhibited in later times.(44) The temple of Diana, on the Aventine, was believed to have been founded by Servius.(45) A statue of Attus Navius preserved the memory of the famous feat of cutting the whetstone, which was performed in the reign of the elder Tarquin.(46) The foundation of the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter was likewise ascribed to one of the Tarquins.(47) The *Vicus Sceleratus* was thought to have gained its name from the crime of the wicked Tullia.(48) It was believed that the Campus Martius had originally belonged to the Tarquins, and was a part of their forfeited property.(49)

---

(35) Eodem anno Ruminalem arborem in Comitio, quæ super octingentos, et quadraginta ante annos Remi Romulique infantiam texerat, mortuis ramalibus et arescente trunco deminutam, prodigii loco habitum est, donec in novos fetus reviresceret. Tac. Ann. xiii. 58. The year referred to is 59 A.D. Concerning the repullulation of the tree, compare the story of the burnt olive-tree, in Herod. viii. 55. See likewise Plin. N. H. xv. 18; Livy, i. 4, who explains *Ruminalis* by *Romularis*. Ovid has the same derivation:

> Arbor erat: remanent vestigia, quæque vocatur
> Rumina nunc ficus, Romula ficus erat.
>
> Fast. ii. 409—10.

Other passages are collected by Becker, vol. i. p. 293; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 420—6.

(36) Ovid, Fast. ii. 379—420.

(37) See Becker, ib. p. 401—418; Below, ch. vi. § 5. The 'casa illa conditoris nostri,' is alluded to in the speech of Camillus against the migration to Veii, Livy, v. 53. Romulus dwelt on the Palatine, according to Dio Cass. liii. 16.

(38) xii. 24. Compare Becker, ib. p. 92—105.

(39) Below ch. 12.

(40) Dion. Hal. ii. 46; Serv. Æn. viii. 641; Festus, in Sacram Viam, p. 290; Becker, vol. i. p. 219.

The state prison at Rome was said to have been built by Ancus Marcius,(50) and beneath it there was a subterranean dungeon—where Catiline's accomplices were strangled—which in the historical age certainly bore the name of Tullianum.(51) This name was understood to allude to Servius Tullius, who was said to have added the dungeon in question.(52)

---

(41) Becker, vol. i. p. 391; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 486.

(42) Becker, ib. p. 513.

(43) Templum ordini ab se aucto curiam fecit, quæ Hostilia usque ad patrum nostrorum ætatem appellata est. Livy, i. 30; Becker, ib. p. 284, 310; ii. 2. p. 408.

(44) Schwegler, ib. p. 571-2; Below ch. xi. § 15.

(45) Livy, i. 45; Becker, vol. i. p. 450.

(46) Becker, ib. p. 291.

(47) Becker, ib. p. 391; Below ch xi. § 33.

(48) Livy, i. 48; Becker, ib. p. 525.

(49) Becker, ib. p. 621.

(50) See Livy, i. 33.

(51) Livy, xxix. 22; Sallust. Cat. 55.

(52) Festus in v. p. 356. Varro de L. L. v. § 151, where the former reading Tullio is erroneously (as it appears) altered by Müller into Tullo. See Becker, vol. i. p. 262-6. The adjective of Tullius is Tullianus—like Valerianus from Valerius, Cornelianus from Cornelius; but from Tullus would be formed Tullinus, like Orcinus from Orcus, libertinus from libertus, Maximinus from maximus.

The accounts given by Dionysius, Varro, and Festus, respecting the locality of the ancient *Roma quadrata*, differ from one another; but there is a general agreement that it was the site of the original foundation of Romulus.(53) The ancient wall of the city, moreover, which Rome, in the time of Dionysius, had far outgrown, and which could with difficulty be traced on account of the surrounding houses, was considered the work of Servius Tullius.(54) Ancus Marcius was believed to have originally fortified the Janiculum.(55)

A small temple of Vesta close to the Forum was called Atrium Regium or Regia; it was supposed to have been the palace of Numa.(56) The places on which the residences of Ancus Marcius and the two Tarquins had stood, were also pointed out in later times.(57) The order in which the seven hills of Rome were occupied under the successive kings, until they all formed part of the town, was likewise described by the historians. There were likewise certain places or buildings in Rome, with a fluctuating legendary story attached to them; but one of its versions connected them with the time of the kings, such as the Vicus Tuscus, the Lacus Curtius, the Porta Pandana, and the Doliola.

The supposed discovery of the stone coffin of Numa and of his sacred books in the year 181 B.C., proves not only that his fame as the founder of the religious institutions of Rome was well established at that time, but also that the anachronism which connected him with the Pythagorean philosophy had already passed into the popular belief.(58)

---

(53) See Becker, vol. i. p. 105-8, 427; Plin. N. H., iii. 5, says that the city of Romulus had either three or four gates. Compare the account, in Dio Cass. Fragm. iv. 15, that it belonged to a præ-Romulean Rome.

(54) Dion. Hal. iv. 13; Becker, ib. p. 129, 171.

(55) Becker, ib. p. 181.

(56) Becker, ib. p. 223-39, 289; Numa was also said to have dwelt on the Quirinal. Plut. Num. 21.

(57) Ib. p. 239.

(58) See Livy, xl. 29; Plin. N.H., xiii. 27; Plut. Num. 22; Val. Max. i. 1, § 12; Augustin. de Civ. Dei, vii. 34; Lactant. Div. Inst. i. 22; Scriptor de Vir. Ill. c. 3. Compare Hartung, vol. i. p. 214; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 564; Below ch. xi. § 13.

§ 4 The existence of laws and other public acts, inscribed on metal or stone, or otherwise preserved in writing, may likewise serve to perpetuate a correct oral tradition, during a period anterior to contemporary history. The use of writing for short and important public acts, must, in Greece, be considered as ascending to the beginning of the Olympiads, and therefore beyond the time assigned to the foundation of Rome. The small warlike commonwealths lying between the Greek settlements of Campania and the twelve cities of Etruria, which spoke the Latin tongue, were doubtless less advanced in civilization than the Greeks; but the use of so important an art as that of alphabetical writing could not fail to reach them at an early period. We shall see presently that certain documents derived from the age of the kings were extant in later times: a treaty made between Rome and Carthage, in the first year of the Republic, was transcribed by Polybius from the original, preserved in a temple at Rome: the laws of the twelve tables were engraved upon brass; lists of the annual magistrates, in a more or less perfect series, were likewise preserved; and some other occurrences were entered in sacred registers. These authentic records served both to refresh the popular memory, and to confine the aberrations and eccentricities of oral tradition within certain limits: they were, so far as they went, a restraint upon wholly unauthorized fiction.

That the decemviral legislation was preserved with perfect fidelity in the original authentic text, cannot be doubted; yet it preceded the Second Punic War, which we have taken as the period of the earliest native contemporary history, by 232 years; so that, while the laws of the Decemvirs were known to the Romans with exactitude, yet the historical narrative of the acts of the Decemvirs, which is delivered to us by Dionysius and Livy, stands on a very different footing. Nevertheless, the preservation of the decemviral code, as of the laws of Solon, was, to a certain extent, a security against the divagations and caprices of legend.

Some of the laws said to have been passed in the period prior to contemporary history were recognised in the period subsequent to it. Thus, in 133 B.C., Tib. Gracchus proposed to re-enact, or revive, the ancient agrarian law of Licinius Stolo, with respect to the occupations of more than 500 jugera of public land, which had fallen into desuetude, or was set at defiance. Now, this law is related to have been passed, after a severe and long continued struggle between the two orders, in the year 367 B.C., only twenty-three years after the Gallic capture of the city, and about a century and a half before the Second Punic War.(59)

Ten years after the passing of his law, Licinius is said to have been fined for a breach of it (357 B.C.). He and his son together occupied 1000 jugera; and he was condemned on the ground that the emancipation of his son, which he had performed in order to enable him to hold land in his own name, was merely colourable.(60) Other proceedings are reported to have been taken by the ediles in the year 298 B.C., sixty-nine years after the passing of the law, for the purpose of punishing persons who occupied a greater quantity of land than that fixed by law.(61) Acts of this sort may have served to keep up the memory of the Licinian law: when Gracchus proposed its revival, it was 234 years old: an age equivalent to the present age of an Act of Parliament passed at the end of the reign of James I.

§ 5 Rubino, a professor at Marburg, the author of a work on the early Roman constitution (still unfortunately left incomplete), has laid down some principles respecting the propagation of the constitutional history of Rome, by oral tradition, which demand our attention.

'The accounts preserved by the Roman writers respecting their ancient times, may (he says) be divided into two classes—

---

(59) See Livy vi. 35; Below ch. xiii.

(60) See Livy vii. 16; Plut. Camill. 39. Tib. Gracchus, in re-enacting the agrarian law of Licinius, relaxed it so far as to permit each of a man's sons to occupy 250 jugera. This relaxation of the law may be considered to be a recognition of the account of the punishment of Licinius, for a contravention of his own law. It was probably considered too severe an adherence to the letter of the Roman law respecting patria potestas, that an adult man should not be allowed to occupy land independently of his father.

(61) Livy x. 13.

differing from each other not only in their substance, but in the sources from which they derived their origin, and in the manner by which they were handed down to posterity. One class, more of an antiquarian character, includes the traditions concerning the constitution, and the religious and civil institutions connected with it. The other, more properly of a historical nature, comprehends narratives of wars, and transactions with the neighbouring states, adventures of celebrated persons, and generally all those striking events which give interest and brilliancy to the Roman history, particularly in the pages of Livy. Upon an attentive examination it is soon perceived, that the former have a very different degree of credibility from the latter. The former were in part reduced to writing at an early period; but even where they were handed down by a merely oral doctrine, were connected with permanent institutions, were kept alive by the proceedings of the Senate, the courts of justice, and the popular assembly, and carefully passed on by statesmen and priests to their successors. The latter, on the other hand, were for a long time left to the exclusive keeping of popular tradition; and from their nature were exposed to the embellishments of fancy, and to the distortions of national and family pride. Hence, the reasons which prove that the later Romans were destitute of an accurate knowledge of the events and circumstances of their early ages, apply almost exclusively to the historical class of traditions, not to those concerning the constitution.'(62)

Somewhat similar views as to the superior certainty of the constitutional history of Rome, compared with the narrative of its civil and military transactions, are expressed by Niebuhr. He considers all the accounts of Rome down to the first secession of the Plebs, in the year 494 B.C.=260 U.C., as devoid of historical foundation.(63) Nevertheless, as we shall see presently, he describes the constitution of Rome under the kings, and the mode of its transition into the consular government, as if its forms rested on certain knowledge.

---

(62) Untersuchungen über Römische Verfassung und Geschichte. Pref. p. vi.

(63) Hist. vol. ii. p. 1.

'Long before we meet with any record of historical individuals (he says), the forms under which the commonwealth existed may be recognised with certainty; so firmly, and for centuries indelibly, were they impressed upon everything, and so entirely was the individual identified with the state.'(64) With regard to Servius, he remarks that the constitution attributed to him requires an explanation, which must be kept apart and removed without the circle of the legends.(65) For the period subsequent to 494 B.C., he holds that 'a genuine, connected, substantially perfect history' can be restored, though occasionally intermixed with fiction and inaccuracy.(66) The early Roman historians, he thinks, possessed a correct knowledge of the constitutional history of their country. The two writers whom he specifies as possessing this knowledge in the greatest perfection, are Fabius Pictor, and a certain Junius Gracchanus, a contemporary of the Gracchi, who appears to have composed some treatises on legal and constitutional subjects.(67)

He declares the highest aim of his researches to be, to approach to the views respecting the ancient constitution and its changes, entertained by Fabius and Gracchanus. These views, he feels assured, were absolutely correct:(68) but he considers them to have been unfaithfully represented, in many instances, by Dionysius, Livy, and the other later writers, who misunderstood and misinterpreted the obsolete technical expressions of constitutional law used by their predecessors.

---

(64) Hist. vol. i. p. 1. 'It is in making out the internal history and condition of the state, that we may be the most successful; even more so than in similar inquiries concerning the Greeks. . . . . During the very ages whose story we can hardly do more than guess at, there was such a proportion and correspondence among the various parts of the constitution, that when a few traces and remains of intelligible import have been brought to light, safe and certain conclusions may be drawn from them concerning other things from which we have no means of clearing away the rubbish, or of which the lowest foundation stones have been torn up: just as in mathematics, if a few points are given, we may dispense with an actual measurement.' Ib. p. 2. Compare also the Preface to vol. ii. p. vi.—'Ere long I saw clearly that, in spite of all scepticism, a critical examination of the facts would enable me to restore and establish a certain and credible history from the epoch at which this volume begins (493 B.C.); and this being so, it became worth while to sift every particular with the utmost care, and during this period not to pass over what, in an age of great events, would have been excluded as trifling. In like manner I perceived that the changes in the constitution might be traced step by step.'

(65) Hist. vol. i. p. 367. (66) Hist. vol. ii. p. 1.

(67) Ib. p. 8-10-12; Lect. vol. i. p. xxi.-xxviii. With respect to the regal period, he says: 'Even Fabius beyond doubt knew nothing more than the story which has come down to us.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 1.

Niebuhr, accordingly, undertakes to restore from conjecture the forms of the early constitution which the writers of the Augustan age misinterpreted.(69) Rubino considers this procedure inadmissible. He maintains that there was only one constitutional history received among the Romans: that this history, as understood in the latter period of the Republic, by well educated Romans, conversant with public affairs, is the true history: that no departure from it can be allowed: and that if the version of the Roman constitution, as adopted by the Romans themselves, is not followed, but is altered by conjecture, all firm historical footing is abandoned; unless we believe that Niebuhr was possessed of a mysterious gift, which enabled him to see what was invisible to all other eyes.(70)

We may assume, as an unquestionable fact, that at the time when Fabius and others began to record in writing the traditions of the Romans respecting the history of their constitution, it was the established practice of the state to be guided by precedents in constitutional matters. Now the existence of a constitutional usage implies, to a certain extent, a knowledge of the constitutional history. Without a reference to precedents—without a comparison of the new cases arising in practice with the similar cases which have previously occurred—such a continuous usage cannot be preserved. No two cases are similar in all points; and it is necessary to understand the circumstances of the cases adduced as precedents, in order to be able to apply them with propriety to the actual case under discussion.

An apt example of the manner in which the Roman constitutional practice was governed by precedents, at the beginning of the Second Punic War, is furnished by Livy. In the year

---

(68) Vol. ii. p. 12. (69) Vol. ii. p. 13-14. (70) Pref. p. ix.-xvi.

209 B.C., in the ninth year of the war, Caius Valerius Flaccus, the flamen of Jupiter, claimed, in right of his office, to sit in the Senate, and he took his seat accordingly. His claim was disallowed by the prætor, L. Licinius, who removed him from the Senate-chamber; whereupon Flaccus appealed to the tribunes. He asserted that the right had belonged of old to his sacerdotal office, and had been conferrèd upon him with the prætexta, the curule chair, and the flaminius.(71) The prætor argued that the right ought to be decided, not by obsolete precedents taken from ancient annals, but by the recent custom of the office; and no flamen of Jupiter had exercised that right in the memory either of their fathers or grandfathers. The tribunes were of opinion, that if the right had been allowed to fall into disuse, through the laches of the flamens, they, and not the office, ought to suffer; so, by a general consent, and without any further resistance on the part of the prætor, the flamen was introduced into the Senate.(72) In this case, it will be observed, an important constitutional right, namely, the right of sitting in the Senate, was decided by precedents which went back beyond two generations, and therefore were probably nearly a century old.

There are various examples in Livy of references to events of the earlier ages during the period subsequent to the commencement of the Second Punic War, which may rest on the accounts of contemporary writers, and may therefore prove the existence of a continuous memory at the times in question. The expedition of Pyrrhus is alluded to on several occasions:(73) the story of the Faliscan traitor sent back by Camillus, and the offer to poison Pyrrhus, are stated to have been referred to in the Senate in 171 B.C., as practical precedents.(74) The ingratitude of the Romans to Camillus is adverted to in the speech of Servilius, in

---

(71) On the flaminius, see Festus p. 53; see Livy i. 20, with respect to the dignity of the Flamen Dialis.

(72) Livy xxvii. 8. Prætor non exoletis vetustate annalium exemplis stare jus, sed recentissimæ cujusque consuetudinis usu volebat.

(73) Livy xxxi. 7, 31; xxxiv. 4; xxxix. 51.

(74) Livy xli. 11, 47.

167 B.C.(75) In discussing the question whether a triumph should be conceded to L. Furius for his victory over the Gauls as prætor, the Senate, in 200 B.C., remarked that 'wars against the Gauls were given by a sort of fate to the Furian family,'(76) alluding to the great Camillus, and his victories over the Gauls nearly two centuries earlier. The speech of the Roman envoy in the Ætolian council, in 200 B.C., reported in Livy, alludes to the Campanian legion sent by the Romans to Rhegium, in the war of Pyrrhus, and commemorates the good deeds of the Romans towards the Campanians, and the fact that they had carried on war for nearly seventy years against the Samnites, with great loss of life, for the benefit of the Campanians.(77) The Caudine disaster naturally left deep traces in the memory of the Romans.(78)

When the registration of public events was scanty, and when the registers which were made were not generally accessible; when public annals and records were meagre, and histories were scarce and only procurable at a great cost; political knowledge was chiefly obtained by personal experience, not by reading. Hence the great importance attached to age, in antiquity, for deliberation, and for the management of public affairs.(79) That skill which is only attainable through practice requires time under all circumstances; but in modern days political knowledge may be acquired through books, without personal observation. In antiquity, this could only be done to a limited extent. Thus Livy mentions, that in the pestilence of 363 B.C., it was remembered by aged men that a previous pestilence had been stopped by the religious ceremony of the dictator driving a nail into a temple.(80) He likewise describes the older senators, when Hannibal was recalled to Carthage, as referring to their memory of the terror produced by his arrival in Italy at the beginning of the war;(81) and on a subsequent occasion, interrogating the Carthaginian ambassadors about the observance of the treaty which they remembered to have been made. The ambassadors themselves, on the other hand, are represented as unable to answer the questions, because they were too young to remember the conclusion of the treaty.(82)

---

(75) Livy xlv. 38. (76) Livy xxxi. 48.

(77) Livy xxxi. 31. The period intended seems to be from 343 to 275 B.C. = 68 years.

(78) Livy xxxv. 11; xxxix. 20.

(79) Concerning the *leges annales* of the Romans, which fixed the age of public officers, see above, p. 91.

(80) Repetitum ex seniorum memoriâ dicitur pestilentiam quondam clavo ab dictatore fixo sedatam. Livy vii. 4. On the subsequent occasion, when the same ceremony was had recourse to, the precedent was found in some historical record: 'memoria ex annalibus repetita.' Livy viii. 18.

To the extent which is implied in the existence of a fixed constitutional and legal practice, we may safely infer that a knowledge of a history of the Roman constitution existed, at the beginning of the Second Punic War: but such a practice does not imply that the knowledge reaches far back, except so far as it may rest on written documents. We cannot reasonably suppose that such of the statesmen and pontiffs as were most versed in antiquarian lore—as were the best depositaries of the traditionary notions on constitutional and legal subjects—could have ascended into the past, with any near approach to accuracy, for much more than a century.

Niebuhr, in his Lectures, makes some just remarks upon the imperfect knowledge of constitutional history, which exists even in modern countries, and among well-informed persons, when the changes in the constitution have been considerable. He limits the application of these remarks, however, to the writers of the Augustan age, who, he thinks, wholly misconceived the early constitution: whereas he holds that it was still understood by Fabius Pictor and his contemporaries.(83)

---

(81) Livy xxx. 21.

(82) Quum, more tradito, patribus potestatem interrogandi, si quis quid vellet, legatos, prætor fecisset; senioresque, qui fœderibus interfuerant, alii alia interrogarent, nec meminisse per ætatem (etenim omnes ferme juvenes erant) dicerent legati; conclamatum ex omni parte curiæ est, Punicâ fraude electos, qui veterem pacem repeterent, cujus ipsi non meminissent. Livy xxx. 22. Neither the Roman nor the Carthaginian Senate could have papers printed for the use of members. Plutarch says that before the Syracusan expedition, the old men at Athens described to circles of listeners the form of Sicily and the position of Libya and Carthage. Alcib. 17. Nic. 12.

(83) 'The former part of his legislation [of Servius Tullius] has been entirely overlooked, and the latter appeared quite mysterious to Livy and

But is there any sufficient ground for making this distinction? Those who lived at the beginning of the Second Punic War, were doubtless better acquainted with the constitution of that time, and of the century immediately preceding, than the writers of the Augustan age could be. Their knowledge of the earlier times must however have been imperfect, faint, and confused—even where it was founded on authentic though meagre traditions, and positively erroneous, if an attempt was made to fill up the outline. The Roman constitution had not indeed undergone any fundamental change in the interval of 230 years between the Decemvirate and the Second Punic War (449—218 B.C.): but during this period, the Canuleian law of 445 B.C., the Licinian laws of 367 B.C.,(84) the laws of the Dictator Publilius Philo of 359 B.C.(85) the Ogulnian law of 300 B.C.,(86) and the Hortensian

---

Dionysius; so great had been the change of affairs since the days of Fabius, who still had a correct view of these matters, though only two hundred years had elapsed from his time. Let him who thinks that this is impossible, look around himself: I believe that in this town [Bonn] there are not three, and at Cologne not ten persons, who can state precisely what the constitutions of these towns were two or three hundred years ago, nay, not even what they were previously to the year 1794. Of this fact I satisfied myself in 1808, in conversation with a Frieslander who had devoted himself to historical pursuits, but was unable to give me any account of the constitution of his country before the French revolution. The same is the case at Brussels. In countries where the constitution has been as little changed as in England, it is easier to trace one's way from the present to the past. It is scarcely credible how great a change two hundred years may bring about, and how distant the whole mode of thinking and living seems to be, when separated from us by some great event. Such was the case in Germany after the Seven Years' war: all German literature previous to that event presents to our minds a character of strangeness, whereas that of the period immediately succeeding seems to us as if it were more or less of yesterday. Such a crisis in literature, and in the entire mode of thinking, had taken place at Rome through the influence of Cicero; so that Livy, Virgil. and Horace, must have thought the authors of the preceding period as strange as we think those who wrote before Lessing and Goethe. The Julian law likewise had so completely changed many circumstances in the civil rights of the Latin allies, that the recollection of the preceding state of things was entirely obliterated. The new constitution was simple, and the ancient complicated institutions were no longer intelligible. Thus it becomes evident—and I beg of you to mark this well—that even ingenious and learned men like Livy and Dionysius did not comprehend the ancient institutions, and yet have preserved a number of expressions from their predecessors, from which we, with much labour and difficulty, may elicit the truth.'—Lect. vol. i. p. 82.

(84) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 1. (85) Ib. p. 150.

(86) Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 352.

law of 287 B.C.(87) all formed important steps in the development of the Roman constitution; which, according to the remark of Cato the Elder, cited in Cicero's dialogue 'de Republicâ,' was not the work of a single lawgiver, nor was it completed in the lifetime of one man, but was gradually built up by a long course of successive measures.(88) The importance of all these changes is pointed out by Niebuhr himself, who describes Rome as even owing its regeneration to one of them.(89) Taken in their aggregate, they were doubtless of sufficient force to transform the practical maxims of government, to alter the relations of the patrician and plebeian orders, and to shift the seat of power.

But even if oral tradition, assisted by the extant texts of the laws, was able to convey a clear, accurate, and full account of the constitutional changes of the 230 years next preceding the Second Punic War, to the historians of that time, what idea could it have afforded of such fundamental changes as the decemviral legislation, and still more, as the conversion of the regal into the consular government?

Niebuhr remarks, that when the form of a constitution has been wholly altered, those who live under the new state of things know little of that which has been superseded. Hence he thinks that Cicero and Livy misconceived their ancient constitution; and that even in modern times, great constitutional changes obliterate the memory of the extinct institutions from men's minds. We see indeed that even full contemporary registration, accompanied with the use of printing, is not sufficient to prevent the memory of institutions, no longer in force, from fading away: the great majority of Frenchmen have doubtless at present but an imperfect idea of the constitution of their country under the old monarchy. What then must we suppose to have been the value or fidelity of the oral accounts of the decemviral revolution, manifestly a period of rapid and violent changes—which reached Fabius more than two centuries after the time? Let anybody examine the intricate course of the constitutional changes at Athens, which intervened between the Syracusan expedition and the year 404 B.C., when the Thirty, a body of legislators with unlimited powers, similar to the Decemvirs, were instituted—and let him consider what sort of history of this period we should have had, if instead of being written by the impartial and painstaking Thucydides, followed by Xenophon, another intelligent contemporary historian, the accounts of it had been collected from oral sources, by some inferior writer, about 200 B.C. in the time of Philopœmen and Nabis.

---

(87) Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 418.

(88) De Rep. ii. 1.

(89) Vol. iii. p. 1.

The change from the regal to the consular government was still more remote, and the notions respecting the state of Rome under the kings still more obscure. To what quarter could Fabius have turned for any authentic views of the constitutional history of the period prior to the year 510 B.C., being at its termination nearly three centuries, and at its supposed commencement nearly five and a-half centuries before his own time? Even Lycurgus, of whom Herodotus says and apparently knew so little, is assigned to a date not much more than 400 years before his time.(90)

Niebuhr, more than once, commends Dion Cassius for the accuracy and precision of his political phraseology, in treating of the early constitution;(91) and he attributes this excellence to the fidelity with which Dion followed the language of Fabius.(92) But Dion, if he was more precise than Livy and Dionysius, must have possessed this superiority without any consciousness of his advantage: for he doubtless understood the ancient constitution in the same sense as they had understood it;

---

(90) See Thuc. i. 18, who places the legislative reform of Sparta 400 years before the end of the Peloponnesian war.

(91) See Hist. vol. i. p. 520.

(92) Hist. vol. ii. p. 12; Lect. vol. 1. p. xxviii. Fabius wrote in Greek, and must have translated all the technical legal terms into that language. 'The Greek language,' says Niebuhr, 'less rich in political terms than the Latin, has only the single word δῆμος to express the whole people and the commonalty. This has given rise to a number of misapprehensions.'—Hist. vol. i. n. 1234.

and Fabius, even if his expressions had been literally reproduced, could have had no accurate knowledge of the constitutional practice and phraseology, for a period so long anterior to his own lifetime.

The manner in which Niebuhr conceives the knowledge of the primitive constitution to have descended upon the historians who composed the annals of their country during and soon after the Second Punic War, but to have been withheld from their successors in the Augustan age, will receive light from an example. We have already had occasion to allude to the statement that P. Valerius lowered his fasces to an assembly of the *people*.(93) The word used by Livy, in relating this event, is *populus*: 'Vocato ad concilium populo, summissis fascibus in concionem ascendit. Gratum id multitudini spectaculum fuit, summissa sibi esse imperii insignia; confessionemque factam, populi quam consulis majestatem vimque majorem esse.'(94) Now Niebuhr, differing from all other prior authorities, ancient and modern, holds that *populus*, in the early Roman history, signifies the patrician order exclusively, without the plebeians.(95) He therefore understands the people, in this passage, to be merely the assembly of the patricians, without the plebeian order; and he accordingly comments on it as follows:—'Our historian,' he says, 'was somewhat in the dark about the meaning of the old constitutional terms, and therefore mixes up the *multitudo* with his narrative; for it certainly never entered his head that this expression might be correctly applied to the patricians of the early ages. To the annalist, from whom he copied the decisive words, the matter must have been perfectly clear.'(96)

In order to support the inference raised in this passage, we must assume—1, That *populus* had, in early times, the meaning assigned to it by Niebuhr; and 2, That Livy transcribed the exact words of some ancient writer, without understanding their true import. But this writer—here called an annalist—could not have been earlier than Fabius, and may not improbably have been later. If he wrote in Latin, he was certainly later. Now, it must be evident that a writer who lived at or after the year 218 B.C., could have had no accurate knowledge of the constitutional language and practice in 509 B.C.—the date assigned to the Valerian laws; and that even if the language of this unknown 'annalist' was literally copied by Livy, we are not entitled to infer that it correctly represents that used in Rome about three centuries before his time.

---

(93) Above § 3. (94) ii. 7.

(95) Hist. vol. i. p. 425.

(96) Ib. p. 530, n. 1172. Concerning the peculiar signification attached by Niebuhr to the word *populus*, see below, ch. xi. § 40.

Elsewhere he treats the writers of the later period of the Republic as possessing authentic information respecting the primitive constitutional history. Thus he says—'The most important piece of information on the Roman constitution, contained in the newly-discovered fragments of Cicero's books on the Republic, is, that after the kings had been elected by the curies, they had still to apply to the same curies for the *imperium*, the refusal of which would have voided their election. *Cicero had the means of knowing this from the books of the pontiffs and augurs;* and, extraordinary as it may sound, that the same assembly had to decide twice over, and could annul its own election by the second decision, he distinctly asserts that such was the case.'(97) Niebuhr here alludes to the circumstance that Cicero, in another passage of his 'Republic,' appeals to the books of the pontiffs and augurs as authority for the fact, that there was an appeal to the people from the acts of the kings.(98) It will however be shown lower down, that no sufficient grounds exist for believing that the records of legal rules and customs made by the pontiffs and augurs ascend to the time of the kings, or that they would have afforded authentic information as to the constitutional theory or practice of that period.(99)

---

(97) Hist. vol. i. p. 335.

(98) See ii. 31. Compare Niebuhr, ib. p. 316, where other points of constitutional law and practice under the kings are referred to the same source.

(99) Below, ch. v. § 12.

One of the passages which Niebuhr cites from Cicero, relates to the constitutional proceedings upon the election of Numa.(100) Yet Niebuhr holds, not merely that the entire regal period is unhistorical, but that Numa is an unreal and imaginary personage—a name, and not a man.(101) Now, what reliance, according to Niebuhr's own view, is to be placed upon Cicero's information respecting a man who never lived, and an event which never happened, even if it was derived from some pontifical book, which professed to record old customs?

So far as an accurate memory and perpetuation of previous constitutional practice is implied in the use of precedents, the history of the constitution may, according to the distinction taken by Rubino, be more faithfully preserved by oral tradition, than the history of single events, such as battles, tumults, pestilences, and exploits of eminent men. But no such broad line can be drawn between the history of a constitution and historical events as this distinction appears to assume. Unless we are more or less informed respecting the events of the history of any country, we cannot follow the progress of its constitution.

---

(100) Qui [Numa] ut huc venit, quamquam populus curiatis eum comitiis regem esse jusserat, tamen ipse de suo imperio curiatam legem tulit. De Rep. ii. 13. See Niebuhr, ib. note 847, and compare Becker, vol. ii. 1, p. 314—35, who takes a different view of the same constitutional practice.

(101) For Niebuhr's account of the legend of Numa, see Hist. vol. i. p. 237—40. Afterwards he says:—'Hence it seems quite evident, that the pontiffs themselves distinguished the first two kings from the rest, as belonging to another order of things, and that they separated the accounts of them from those which were to pass for history. . . . . Romulus was the god, the son of a god; Numa a man, but connected with superior beings. If the tradition about them however is in all its parts a *poetical fiction*, the fixing the pretended term of their reigns can only be explained by ascribing it either to mere caprice or to numerical speculations:' ib. p. 245. 'With Tullius Hostilius we reach the beginning of a new secle, and of a narrative resting on historical ground of a kind *totally different* from the story of the preceding period:' p. 246. Niebuhr considers the mythico-historical age of Roman history to begin with the reign of Tullius Hostilius; and the age of Romulus and Numa to be purely fabulous. Moreover, he commences the second volume of his history with the following sentence—'It was one of the most important objects of the first volume to prove that the story of Rome under the kings was *altogether without historical foundation*.' Compare his Lectures, vol. i. p. 41-69, respecting the unhistorical character of the regal period. He there says that 'up to this point [the death of Numa] we have had nothing except poetry.' He lays it down likewise that the names of the kings, their number, and the duration and dates of their reigns, are fictitious: yet he cites the proceedings at the election of Numa, and of the subsequent kings, as historical proof of the constitutional practice of that period.

For example, if we take England during the seventeenth century, we cannot treat its constitutional changes *in vacuo*, and as abstracted from all public transactions and occurrences. The constitutional history of England during that period cannot be understood, unless we are informed as to the nature of the struggle between Charles and the Parliament; the characters of the leaders of the contending parties; the grounds of the Civil war, and the manner of its outbreak; its progress and final issue; the king's execution; the Protectorate; and lastly, the restoration of kingly government under Charles II. Similar facts must in like manner be known before the progress of the constitution, during the reign of Charles II. and after the expulsion of James II., can be rightly appreciated. The most approved writers who have described the progress of a constitution during a historical period (for example, Mr. Hallam) have combined their subject with the events and actions of the time; and have introduced into their narrative all the main facts which serve to keep the political drama in motion. Without knowing the events and facts, we cannot know that constitutional forms retain the same meaning. The forms of a government may be preserved intact, while its essence and operation have undergone a radical change. They may become a mere mask, behind which the real face is concealed. Among a people like the Romans, who attached great importance to legal forms, and to the connexion of religion with the state, it was peculiarly likely that constitutional changes, demanded by the altered state of society, and by the increased power of new classes of the community, should be effected with little apparent departure from ancient usage.(102) A constitutional history, written without a knowledge of events and actions, and of the forces silently operating through society, might represent Augustus Cæsar as the mere annual magistrate of a free commonwealth, or might suppose that the relations of Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria to their respective parliaments were identical.(103)

---

(102) Compare Livy's account of the election of Numa—'Decreverunt, ut cum populus regem jussisset, id sic ratum esset, si patres auctores fierent; hodieque in legibus magistratibusque rogandis *usurpatur idem jus, vi*

These general remarks on the preservation of the early constitutional history of Rome by oral tradition, will suffice for the present. We shall have occasion hereafter to examine in detail some of the evidence on which the chief constitutional changes rest.

§ 6 There is a third class of historical facts, being neither constitutional changes, nor political events, which Niebuhr considers to have been preserved from early times by a trustworthy oral tradition, down to the Second Punic War, or even to a later period. These are the accounts of Italian ethnology; the history of the origin, migrations, and affinities of the several nations and tribes settled on the soil of Italy. 'If (says Niebuhr) we

---

ademtâ. Priusquam populus suffragium ineat, in incertum comitiorum eventum patres auctores fiunt:' i. 17; see below, ch. xi. § 11. Niebuhr himself says that the ritual and religious laws 'were the laws obeyed at first by the Romans, who relaxed their ties, without casting them aside; and whose anxiety never to abolish them, but to leave the appearance subsisting, when the reality had lost its meaning, was a result of their original sanctity.'—Hist. vol. i. p. 140. Machiavel remarks that in making political changes, the Romans carefully maintained the appearance of the ancient institutions.—Disc. i. 25. Tacitus gives the name of *simulacrum*, to an institution, the form of which is retained after the substance has perished —Ann. vi. 11.

(103) Niebuhr, in his Lectures, makes the following remarks upon the change which had taken place in the constitution of Rome at the time of the war against Philip. 200 B.C.—' It is one of the greatest errors to believe that a constitution remains the same as long as its forms continue unaltered. When changes have taken place in the distribution of property, in the social condition, in the sentiments and the mode of life of a nation, the nature of its constitution may become quite the reverse of what it originally was. even though not an iota may have been altered in its form. It may at one time be democratical, and at another it may, with the same forms, be aristocratical. We moderns pay too little attention to such internal changes, although they are among those points which we must endeavour to ascertain. and without which history cannot be understood. The constitution of the Roman republic was at that time quite different from what it had been, although no formal change had been made in it.'—vol. ii. p. 160.

had the Origines of Cato and the history of Q. Fabius Pictor, we might dispense with all speculations concerning the early history of the nations of Italy.'(104)

The work of Fabius appears to have given only a succinct narrative of the foundation of the city and the early period, written in an antique and uncritical spirit;(105) so that, if it were extant, it would throw little light upon Italian ethnology. Cato's history was professedly a work of origins: the first book was devoted to the regal period of Rome, the second and third to the origins of the Italian cities. There is no doubt that the loss of this work is much to be deplored; and we would gladly obtain it in exchange for his Treatise on Agriculture, which has been preserved: but the few remains of his first book which are extant, lead to the inference that it dealt chiefly with legendary subjects, and that the stories which he collected resembled those compiled by the early Greek logographers, which were not derived from authentic traditions, but were fictitious and mythical. Thus it will hardly be contended that the notices in the first book respecting the aborigines who had inhabited the Volscian territory; or the directions given by Mezentius to the Rutulians about the disposition of their first-fruits; or the deaths of Latinus, Turnus, and Mezentius; or the derivation of the name of Rome from that of the sister of Latinus, the son of Ulysses and Circe; or the arrival of Anchises in Italy; or the birth of thirty swine on the site of Lavinium, and the appearance of the Penates to Æneas in a dream:(106) together with various other particulars respecting Æneas and Ascanius: or his numerical statements that the quantity of territory first given by king Latinus to the Trojans was exactly 700 jugera, and that Rome was founded 432 years after the taking of Troy,(107) were of any historical value, or were derived from any authentic source, oral or written.

---

(104) Lectures, vol. 1, p. xxxvi.

(105) See particularly the legend of Romulus and Remus, as recited at length after Fabius in Dion. Hal. i. 79.

(106) See Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 12, § 5. A similar account is given in Dion. Hal. i, 56, but without any reference to Cato's Origins.

(107) See Krause, p. 98—106.

His accounts of the origins of the Italian cities, which were chiefly contained in the second and third books, seem equally to refer to the imaginary events of a long-forgotten antiquity, and to be destitute of the historical character. What light is thrown on Italian ethnology by Cato's statement, that Cæculus, the supposed founder of Præneste, was found in a hearth by virgins seeking water, and that he was thence called the son of Vulcan ;(108) and that the name of Præneste was derived from its elevated situation :(109) or that Pisæ was occupied by some Teutons, who spoke Greek, before it was refounded by Tarchon, the descendant of Tyrrhenus ?(110) What do we learn from the information that Tibur was founded by Catillus the Arcadian, the son of Amphiaraus, and grandson of Œcleus, who came to Italy as commander of Evander's fleet ?(111) or that Rhegium was occupied first by the Aurunci, afterwards by Greeks returning from Troy ; and that Orestes came to that district with Iphigenia and Pylades in order to expiate the death of his mother ;(112) or that Politorium was founded by Polites, a companion of Æneas :(113) or that the Veneti were descended from the Trojans :(114) or that Ameria was founded 964 years before the war against Perseus ;(115) that is, 964 years before 168 B.C. ?

Elsewhere, Niebuhr adverts to the statement of Antiochus, preserved in Strabo, and confirmed by Aristotle, that the

---

(108) Nec Prænestinæ fundator defuit urbis,
Vulcano genitum pecora inter agrestia regem,
Inventumque focis, omnis quem credidit ætas,
Cæculus.—Virg. Æn. vii. 678—81.

Where the Scholiast, published by Mai, says: 'Cato in Originibus ait, Cæculum virgines aquam petentes in foco invenisse, ideoque Vulcani filium existimasse ; et quod oculos exiguos haberet, Cæculum appellatum.'

(109) Serv. Æn. vii. 682.

(110) Ap. Serv. ad Æn. x. 159. (Krause, p. 106.)

(111) Solinus, c. 2, § 8. Compare Æn. vii. 670.

(112) Probus ad Virg. Ecl. vol. ii. p. 348, ed. Lion.

(113) Serv. ad Æn. v. 564.

(114) Plin. H. N. iii. 19.

(115) Plin. H. N. iii. 14. Compare Krause, p. 106—9.

Ausones and the Opici, who occupied the country to the south-east of Etruria, were different appellations for the same people; and to the statement of Polybius, that the Ausones and the Opici were two distinct nations, who dwelt near Mount Vesuvius.(116) Upon this divergence of Polybius from the other testimony, he remarks that 'no one is endowed with every gift, and that historian who is so excellent with regard to the period immediately before his view, is of no authority on points of primitive history, which he took no interest in investigating.'(117)

If the period which is here in question is of remote antiquity, it must have been as obscure to Antiochus, who was somewhat later than Herodotus,(118) as it was to Polybius. With respect to the indifference about remote antiquity which Niebuhr attributes to Polybius, it may have arisen from a belief that all labour in investigating it would be lost; and it is certain that if he had attempted to penetrate the obscurity which enveloped the primitive history of the Italian nations, his endeavour would have been fruitless. The history had not been written, and the traditionary memory was long since extinct. This censure of Polybius for not informing himself about the history of a period for which no authentic materials existed, may be compared with a similar censure cast upon him by Dr. Arnold for his ignorance of geography:(119) the fact being that geography had, in the time of Polybius, been very little cultivated; that there were no accurate maps or geographical treatises, and that no means existed of acquiring an accurate idea of the geography of any country. It was therefore just as impossible to Polybius to be a good geographer, as to be a good astronomer, or a good chemist; and it was equally impossible for him to learn the early ethnology of Italy, seeing that no knowledge concerning the primitive state of the Italian nations had been preserved.(120)

---

(116) Strabo, v. 4, § 3; Aristot. Pol. vii. 10.

(117) Hist. vol. i. p. 65.

(118) He brought down his Sicilian History to the year 424 B.C. Diod. xii. 71.

(119) Hist. of Rome, vol. iii. p. 412, 473, 478. In the latter passage, he says, with respect to Hannibal's passage over the Alps: 'The difficulty to modern inquirers has arisen chiefly from the total absence of geographical talent in Polybius. That this historian indeed should ever have gained the reputation of a good geographer, only proves how few there are who have any notion what a geographical instinct is.'

In like manner, Niebuhr treats the statement that Alba was the leading state of Latium before the reign of Tullus Hostilius, as a tradition founded on good authority, because it is traced to Cincius.(121) Gerlach and Bachofen, in their recent history, likewise characterize his testimony on the early relations of Alba and Rome, as 'free from all doubt.'(122) Now, whether we consider the testimony adduced to be that of Cincius Alimentus, the early historian, or of some later Cincius,(123) its date is at least about four and a-half centuries after the time assigned for the destruction of Alba, and therefore it has, in itself, no weight.

With respect indeed to events of early times, and to primitive states of society, which were unrecorded by contemporary writers, and had consequently passed into oblivion, it is equally out of place to extol a later writer for his knowledge, or to censure him for his ignorance. Thus, when we are told, on the one hand, that Sallust 'displays an uncommon knowledge of the ancient constitution,'(124) and, on the other, that Cicero was 'a stranger to the early history of his country,' and that his work 'De Republicâ' shows how very slight was his knowledge of the constitution when he began writing it,(125) we may be disposed rather to place their knowledge and their ignorance on a level, and to assume that both were equally well acquainted with the accounts of the early history and constitution which had been framed by writers subsequent to the Second Punic War.

---

(120) Niebuhr elsewhere remarks, that the confidence which is due to Polybius with respect to times near his own, does not extend to the times soon after the Gallic capture of Rome. Hist. vol. iii. p. 76.

(121) Lect. vol. i. p. 26.

(122) Geschichte der Römer, vol. i, part 1, p. 193, 237. The absurdity of treating Cincius as a 'witness' for this remote period, even if the early Cincius were meant, is pointed out by Schwegler, vol. i. p. 330.

(123) See Festus, prætor ad portam, p. 241. This passage is referred by Krause, ib. p. 76, to a different and later Cincius. It is taken from a work 'De Consulum potestate.' Legal and antiquarian treatises of this class probably belong to a somewhat later date than the Second Punic War. —Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 99, remarks, that Cæsar would have been a decisive authority to prove that the Romans derived their arms from the Samnites. Cæsar was master of the art of war in his own time; but even he could not know the military history of his own country by intuition.

(124) Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. 129. He appears however to confound the speech of Licinius Macer with the passages preserved in Augustin. Civ. Dei. ii. 18, v. 12. See Sallust. Fragm. p. 9 and 272, ed. Kritz. The words 'Soli in imperiis habitabant,' which Niebuhr cites from Sallust, appear to refer to the words 'Soli in imperio agere,' ib. p. 12.

§ 7 Having thus inquired how far the earliest Roman historians could have obtained accurate accounts of their antiquity from oral traditions, we proceed to examine what were the other sources from which they drew the materials of their narrative.

In framing the historical narrative of the events of their own and the immediately preceding time, Fabius and the other early historians doubtless relied chiefly on oral accounts derived from original witnesses: but in proportion as they receded from their own time, the uncertainty of oral information, and the importance of resting on some fixed basis of contemporary writing, must have made itself felt. Although there were no histories of the early period of Rome, yet as the art of writing had been long known and practised, there must have been some records, more permanent than the fleeting and evanescent breath of oral tradition, to which they could have recourse. Let us, then, inquire what were the written memorials, convertible to the use of the historian, which were in existence when the earliest histories of the first four and a half centuries of Rome were composed.

---

(125) Niebuhr, ib. p. xliv. Cicero appears, from the passages in the Treatises de Legibus and De Oratore, to have been familiar with the writings of all the native historians before his own time. Niebuhr speaks of his not having made use of Junius Gracchanus, ib.: compare p. xliv. Hist. vol. ii. p. 10: but little has been preserved of the writings of Gracchanus. See Krause, p. 221, 2; and as he was the contemporary and friend of C. Gracchus, he could have had no independent information respecting the early constitution. We do not know that Cicero had not read his writings. Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 150, indeed conjectures that he is the Junius alluded to by Cicero, Leg. iii. 20. Compare Mercklin, Comment. i. and ii. de Junio Gracchano, Dorpat, 1840, 1. In Comment. ii. p. 50—3, he points out the exaggerations of Niebuhr respecting Gracchanus.

The written memorials capable of being used for historical purposes, which were in existence when Fabius and Cincius composed their histories, may, as it appears, be arranged under three heads. 1. Records and memorials of a public nature. 2. Private memorials. 3. Poems. We propose to examine each of these classes in order.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEMORIALS OF THE ROMAN STATE, FOR THE PERIOD BEFORE THE WAR WITH PYRRHUS.

§ 1 THE administration of the Roman state had, from the earliest times during which we can trace its operations, a practical and orderly character: and although there were no permanent paid civil functionaries, and no offices such as those of a modern government, for the transaction of business and the preservation of documents; yet a body of scribes, or clerks, who were often freedmen or slaves, was employed in the various duties of the government connected with registration and writing.(1) From an early, though uncertain time, some minutes were made of the acts and orders of the Senate, and of the judicial proceedings and decisions of the proper magistrates: the financial business, which was under the control of the Senate,(2) must have necessitated the employ of some scribes; and the business of the census, involving the enumeration of persons and the assessment of property, could not have been carried on without much writing.(3)

An incident which occurred in the eighth year of the Second Punic War (210 B.C.) will serve to illustrate the use made of writing for the financial business of the state at this period. In the urgency of the financial distress produced by this war, the consuls recommended a voluntary surrender of all gold and silver, and brazen money, in the hands of individuals, beyond a certain defined amount, for the use of the Republic. This appeal was promptly answered; and there was so great a pressure round the public officers, by persons bringing their gifts of money and precious metal, and so active a desire to be inscribed among the first in this national subscription list, that the triumvirs (says Livy) were not sufficiently numerous for receiving the donations, or the scribes for entering the names.(4)

---

(1) On the subject of the *Scribæ*, and of the official writers generally, see Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 298—300; Lectures, vol. i. p. 387; Becker, ii. 2, p. 372. Concerning the *γραμματεῖς*, or clerks of the Athenians, see Boeckh, Econ. of Athens, b. ii. c. 8. Scribæ, qui nobiscum in rationibus monumentisque publicis versantur, says Cic. de dom. 20.

(2) Polyb. vi. 13.

(3) On the writing business of the censors, see Livy, iv. 8.

About the end of the fourth century, B.C., Cn. Flavius published the forms of action hitherto kept secret in the archives of the pontiffs, together with a calendar of the days on which actions could be tried; his calendar was inscribed upon wooden tablets covered with white plaster, which he exhibited (like modern placards or bills) in the Forum.(5) Flavius was a *scriba*, or clerk, the son of a freedman, and of humble origin; but this act obtained him such popularity, that, in spite of the opposition of the nobles, he was elected curule ædile in the year 304 B.C.(6) At this time, therefore, nearly a century before the Second Punic War, there was a written system of technical jurisprudence, with respect to the forms and conduct of actions, in the custody of the pontifical officers. Hitherto it had been concealed from the public; having been preserved as a state-secret, and a sort of sacred mystery, by the patrician body; and its disclosure, in the manner indicated, was considered an act which entitled Flavius to the gratitude of the people at large.

---

(4) Senatu inde misso, pro se quisque aurum, argentum et æs in publicum conferunt; tanto certamine injecto, ut prima inter primos nomina sua vellent in publicis tabulis esse; ut nec trumviri accipiundo, nec scribæ referundo sufficerent. Livy, xxvi. 36. The triumvirs in question are called triumviri mensarii.

(5) See Livy, ix. 46. Eodem anno Cn. Flavius, scriba, patre libertino, humili fortunâ ortus, cæterum callidus vir et facundus, ædilis curulis fuit. . . . . Civile jus repositum in penetralibus pontificum evulgavit, fastosque circa forum in albo proposuit, ut quando lege agi posset sciretur.

(6) Concerning Flavius, see Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 296, 314—9; Lect. vol. i. p. 388, 391; Fischer ad ann. 304, p. 62; Arnold, vol. ii. p. 286; Becker, ii. 1, p. 22. Below, ch. xiii. § 38.

The existence of a body of official scribes, and of a written collection of rules of judicial procedure, as well as the mode adopted by Flavius for divulging this technical system, prove that writing was at this period familiarly used, and upon a tolerably large scale, at Rome, for purposes of public business.

As this state of things could not be of recent creation, we may assume, without much risk of error, that in the 172 years which elapsed between the conflagration of the city and the Second Punic War (390-218 B.C.), all the most important laws and acts of the state were reduced into writing, at the time of their occurrence, by official scribes. What provision was made for the custody of these documents, and how far they were safely preserved, it is more difficult for us, with our scanty sources of information, to judge.

§ 2 Those official documents which were written upon parchment, or papyrus, or any other material corresponding to paper which the Romans were able to use, were probably carried away by each magistrate at the expiration of his term of office, and preserved in his family in a more or less complete state. The *Commentarii Censorum*—the official documents or memorials of the censors—which must have related in great part to the formation of the census—are particularly mentioned by Dionysius as having been religiously transmitted from father to son, like hereditary *sacra*, in the censorian families—and he adds that many distinguished persons of these families preserved them in his time.(7) The establishment of the censorship is referred to the year 443 B.C.

It appears, moreover, from a passage in Cicero's oration for Archias, that, in his time, the official records of the prætors remained in their own custody, and were not transferred to any public office or archive.(8) Hence Pliny speaks of the memorials of transactions in public magistracies, being preserved in the repositories of private individuals.(9)

---

(7) *δηλοῦται δ' ἐξ ἄλλων τε πολλῶν καὶ τῶν καλουμένων τιμητικῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἃ διαδέχεται παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς, καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιεῖται τοῖς μεθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐσομένοις ὥσπερ ἱερὰ πατρῷα, παραδιδόναι. πολλοὶ δ' εἰσὶν ἀπὸ τῶν τιμητικῶν οἴκων ἄνδρες ἐπιφανεῖς οἱ διαφυλάττοντες αὐτά.* i. 74. See Becker, ii. 1, p. 25.

(8) Pro Arch. 5.

Cicero, in defending himself against the charge of having recorded a false report of the oral evidence given by the informers to the Senate in the Catilinarian conspiracy, states that he employed certain senators to take notes of the proceedings; that these documents were indeed, according to the ancient practice, preserved in private hands; but that instead of keeping them concealed in his own house, he had caused copies of them to be made, and published to all the world.(10)

That such should have been the ordinary practice at Rome is not to be wondered, when it is remembered that even in England, up to a comparatively late date, it was the practice for the Secretaries of State, and other high officers, to carry away all their official correspondence on going out of office. The uninterrupted series of official correspondence for the offices of Secretaries of State does not ascend higher than the latter part of the last century.

§ 3 There were, however, at Rome certain official depositories—*tabulæ publicæ*, or *tabularia*(11)—in which various documents of a public nature were preserved—some perhaps of a judicial, others of an administrative nature—together with transcripts of legislative acts; but our information does not enable us to specify what they contained; and the general practice, as has been already stated, doubtless was that the annual and other magistrates carried away their documents at the expiration of their office. The accounts of captured property rendered by the commanders appear to have been preserved in the treasury (*ærarium*),(12) and Cicero remarks that the order of *scribæ*, or paid subordinate civil servants (like the *writers* of the East India Company) could not be otherwise than respectable, because the public accounts, and the safety of the magistrates, were at their mercy.(13)

---

(9) Tablina codicibus implebantur, et monumentis rerum in magistratu gestarum. Plin. N. H. xxxv. 2. Compare Festus, p. 356. Tablinum proxime atrium locus dicitur, quod antiqui magistratus in suo imperio tabulis [reponendis eum destinaverant].

(10) 'Itaque introductis in Senatum indicibus, constitui senatores, qui omnia indicum dicta, interrogata, responsa perscriberent. . . . Quid deinde? quid feci? quum scirem ita indicium in tabulas publicas relatum, ut illæ tabulæ privatâ tamen custodiâ, *more majorum*, continerentur; non occultari, non continui domi, sed describi ab omnibus statim librariis, dividi passim et pervulgari atque edi populo Romano imperavi.' Pro Sulla, c. 14—5. Compare Merimée, Conjuration de Catilina, p. 207.

(11) 'Nec ferrea jura,
Insanumque forum, aut populi tabularia vidit.'
Virg. Georg. ii. 501-2, where see Servius.

§ 4 The laws made by the popular legislative assemblies were sometimes engraved upon brass, in order to ensure their permanence.(14) It is expressly mentioned that the laws of the Twelve Tables were preserved in this manner, and that the brazen plates were fixed up in the Forum.(15) Other laws were perpetuated on the same durable material;(16) thus the decree respecting the Bacchanalians, now preserved at Vienna, is engraved on brass.(17) Some laws likewise were engraved on stone; which was the established practice at Athens. The decrees conferring honours upon Julius Cæsar, during his lifetime, were written with golden letters upon silver columns; which were dedicated in the Capitol.(18)

---

(12) Cic. Verr. i. 21. In Pis. 25. The law respecting the accounts of provincial magistrates was altered by the Lex Julia, (46 B.C.) Cic. Ep. Div. v. 20.

(13) Verr. iii. 79. Ordo est honestus. Quis negat, aut quid ea res ad hanc rem pertinet? Est vero honestus, quod eorum hominum fidei tabulæ publicæ periculaque magistratuum committuntur.

The documents preserved in public archives were sometimes fraudulently burnt, and sometimes forged. Cic. De Nat. Deor. iii. 30. The public archive of Heraclea was destroyed by fire in the Social war. Cic. pro Arch. 5. A *scriba librarius* seems to have been a clerk who was a mere writer.

(14) This mode of perpetuating writings is alluded to by Horace. Exegi monumentum ære perennius. Carm. iv. 30.

(15) Dion. Hal. x. 57; Livy, iii. 57; Diod. xii. 26. See below, ch. xii. § 2.

(16) An ancient law engraved on a brazen column in the consulship of Pinarius and Furius, 472 B.C. was mentioned by Varro, Macrob. Sat. i. 13. The engraving of laws on brass is mentioned as the common practice in the latter years of the Republic in Suet. Cæsar, 28. Three thousand brazen tablets of laws were destroyed in the conflagration of the Capitol under Vitellius: Suet. Vesp. 8. Cicero mentions that the 'Legum æra,' in the Capitol were melted by lightning in 65 B.C. Cat. iii. 8; De Div. i. 12. Compare Dio Cass. xxxvii. 9; Obsequens de Prodig. c. 122. Other inscriptions on brazen columns are mentioned by Dio Cass. xliv. 53, lvi. 33. Tacitus, Ann. xi. 14, speaks of publishing plebiscita on brazen plates fixed in forums and temples.

(17) See Goettling, Funfzehn Römische Urkunden auf Erz und Stein: Halle, 1845.

These tablets, of brass or other durable material, appear to have been preserved in the Capitol, or fixed against the walls of some of the temples. There was, however, no one place of deposit for all Roman statutes, nor was there any complete collection of them, or any authentic publication of copies. Transcripts were procured from private copyists, whenever they were wanted.(19)

§ 5 A few fragments of laws, purporting to belong to the time of the kings, have been preserved in ancient writers, but we know nothing of the grounds on which they are referred to this early period; and still less, how they are connected with particular kings.(20)

Livy says generally, that after the Gallic conflagration, the magistrates for the year ordered all the laws which could be recovered, to be sought after; these were the laws of the Twelve Tables, and some laws of the kings.(21) It is unquestionable that the later Romans had certain laws, or written legal rules, which they either referred generally to the regal period, under the name of *leges regiæ*, or which they assigned to particular kings. Dionysius cites a law of Numa, in which it was written, that, 'if a father should permit his son to marry a wife, who is to share his sacred rites and property, according to the laws, it shall not be lawful for the father to sell the son:' a provision which Dionysius considers to have been adopted from the law of Numa into the decemviral code.(22) Other passages from his laws are cited in the collection of Festus, and by other writers.(23) Cicero likewise speaks in general terms, of laws of Numa which were extant in his time.(24)

---

(18) Dio Cass. xliv. 7.

(19) 'Legum custodiam nullam habemus. Itaque hæ leges sunt, quas apparitores nostri volunt; a librariis petimus, publicis litteris consignatam memoriam publicam nullam habemus.'—Cic. de Leg. iii. 20. The *apparitores* were the subordinate officers who were personally attached to the superior magistrates.

(20) The extant fragments of the royal laws are collected by Dirksen, Versuche zur Kritik und Auslegung der Quellen des Römischen Rechts, p. 234—68.

(21) vi. 1.

(22) ii. 27. Compare Dirksen, ib. p. 333.

Some references are further made to laws of Servius Tullius,(25) and a law of Romulus and Tatius is cited in a corrupt fragment of Festus;(26) but, with these exceptions, all the extant references to the legislation of individual kings, specify the laws of Numa.

An excerpt of Marcellus in the Digest, quotes from a *lex regia*, a prohibition to bury a pregnant woman, without opening her body for the purpose of saving the child.(27)

Whenever the Romans wished to assign a law to a remote and undated antiquity, they spoke of it as a 'royal law;'(28) and if the law related to some matter of sacred discipline or regulation, they attributed it to Numa, who was considered the primeval founder and author of all ordinances of this description. Thus Livy represents L. Valerius, the tribune, in 195 B.C., in arguing for the repeal of the Oppian law, a sumptuary enactment respecting women, passed during the Second Punic War, to have asked, Whether it was an ancient royal law, as old as the city itself? or, Whether—what was next in point of antiquity—it was even as old as the decemviral code?(29)

---

(23) See Festus in aliuta, p. 6; occisum, p. 178; opima spolia, p. 189; parrici [di] quæstores, p. 221; pellices, p. 222, and Gell. N. A. iv. 3; termino, p. 368; also Plin. xiv. 12, (Dirksen, p. 318); Plin. xxxii. 10, on fish, (Dirksen, p. 316); Plin. xiv. 12 (Dirksen, p. 320.

(24) De Rep. ii. 14; v. 2.

(25) Tac. Ann. xii. 8. Festus, pro censu, p. 246. An expression from the 'descriptio classium quam fecit Ser. Tullius' is cited in Festus in procum, p. 249.

(26) In plorare, p. 230.

(27) Dig. xii. 8, § 2; (Dirksen. p. 327). Concerning the leges regiæ, see Gibbon, Decl. and Fall, c. 44, ad init. Pomponius, Dig. i. 2, 2, § 3, says that the leges regiæ had become obsolete, and that the Roman people began to be governed by unwritten and consuetudinary law: whence the necessity for the decemviral legislation. This is an attempt to reconcile the accounts of the leges regiæ, of a written legislation under the kings, with the non-existence of written laws as the cause of the decemviral legislation.

(28) Thus Cicero affirms that the law protecting a citizen against punishment without a legal judgment, was as old as the kings: 'Hoc juris in hâc civitate, etiam tum cum reges essent, dico fuisse,' (Pro dom. 13) an assertion for which he had probably no special evidence. He meant to say that the law was very ancient.

That the legal rules which the later Romans called royal laws, and referred to some of their kings, were genuine remnants of their early jurisprudence, and of antique consuetudinary law, cannot be doubted; but, in examining the nature of the historical evidence for the period of the kings, we shall find that there is no sufficient ground for supposing that these laws are traceable to the kingly period, as the laws of the Twelve Tables are traceable to the Decemvirs.(30)

Dionysius informs us, that Numa reduced all his legislation on sacred things into writing, and divided his regulations into eight portions.(31) That after his death, his successor, Ancus Marcius, collected his ordinances from the pontiffs, and transcribed them upon tables, which he exhibited in the Forum to the public. 'These copies,' says Dionysius, 'were subsequently lost, but after the expulsion of the kings, they were republished by the chief pontiff, Caius Papirius.'(32) The latter must be a different person from Manius Papirius, whom Dionysius afterwards states to have been the first king of the sacrifices.(33) The collection of laws described by Dionysius was limited to the religious ordinances of Numa; but we hear likewise of the existence of a collection of royal laws, made by a certain Sextus Papirius, who lived under Tarquinius Superbus, and who would appear to be different from either of the persons named by Dionysius. To this Papirius a collection of laws is attributed, which has passed by the name of Jus Civile Papirianum; but although such a compilation was doubtless used by the jurists of the imperial period, both its authenticity and antiquity are extremely problematical.(34)

---

(29) Livy, xxxiv. 4. The law was passed in 215 B.C. and repealed in 195 B.C., so that it remained in force twenty years.

(30) Below, ch. xi. §. 39.

(31) ii. 63.

(32) iii. 36. Livy gives the same account. 'Longe antiquissimum ratus sacra publica, ut ab Numâ institutā erant, facere, omnia ea ex commentariis regis pontificem maximum in album relata proponere in publico jubet,' i. 32. Compare Hartung, vol. i. p. 212. The account of the laws engraved on wooden planks, seems an invention to account for the disappearance of the original laws attributed to Numa, and supposed to have been transcribed and promulgated by Ancus Marcius. There is no mention of this mode of writing elsewhere:—*ἐν δρυίναις ἐχαράττοντο σανίσιν οἵ τε νόμοι καὶ αἱ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν διαγραφαί*, and it is probably a fiction. When wooden planks were used, they were probably covered with plaster, and treated as painters use them. The proscription-lists of Sylla are called *τὰ λευκώματα τὰ Σύλλεια* by Dio Cass. xlv. 17.

(33) v. 1.

Livy mentions, under the year 363 B.C., the existence of an old law, written in antique characters and language, directing that the 'prætor maximus' should fix a nail, on the Ides of September. These nails were driven into the right side of the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol; and Livy seems to consider this law of later date than the consecration of the temple, which is placed shortly after the expulsion of the kings.(35)

§ 6 According to the statement of Livy, the senatus-consulta (that is to say the decrees, or ordinances made by the Senate, on its own independent authority,) remained originally in the custody of the consuls; but in the year 449 B.C., in the important consulship of Valerius and Horatius, after the abolition of the Decemvirate, the consuls made a regulation that the senatus-consulta should be deposited in the temple of Ceres, in the custody of the plebeian ediles.(36)

In later times, they were kept in the ærarium; and no senatus-consultum took effect, or had the force of law, until it had been there deposited. This rule was already in existence in the year 187 B.C., when it is mentioned in connexion with the application of Fulvius for a triumph.(37)

§ 7 The treaties between independent states were at an early period, on account of their solemnity and importance, inscribed on durable materials, and carefully preserved. One of the most ancient Greek inscriptions extant is a treaty between the Eleans and Heræans, engraved on a small brass plate, now in the British Museum. The treaties recited in the fifth book of Thucydides were likewise, doubtless, copied from the stone pillars on which they were chiselled.

---

(34) See Dirksen, ib. p. 236—9; Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 249; vol. ii. p. 281; Becker, vol. i. p. 14; Klotz, Lateinische Litteraturgeschichte, vol. i. p. 318; Dig. l. 15, § 144; Macrob. Sat. iii. 11.

(35) See Livy, vii. 3. Lex vetusta est, priscis litteris verbisque scripta, ut qui prætor maximus sit, idibus Septembribus clavum pangat.

(36) Institutum etiam ab iisdem consulibus, ut senatusconsulta in ædem Cereris ad ædiles plebis deferrentur, quæ ante arbitrio consulum supprimebantur, vitiabanturque. Livy iii. 55. According to some writers consulted by Livy, the ediles, by the direction of the tribunes, and not the consuls, caused the Twelve Tables to be engraved on brass. ib. c. 57. A written record of a senatus-consultum in 442 B.C. is mentioned by Livy, iv. 11.

(37) See Livy, xxxix. 4. Compare Suet. Aug. 94; Tac. Ann. iii. 51.

The earliest documents to which the Roman historians had access were treaties. Dionysius describes, apparently from personal observation, the ancient treaty made by Servius Tullius with the Latin cities, which was preserved in his time in the Federal temple of Diana, on the Aventine. It was engraved on a brazen pillar, in Greek characters of an archaic form, but, as it appears, was composed in the Latin language.(38)

A treaty said to have been made by Tarquinius Superbus with the people of Gabii was, after having been ratified by the solemn oaths of the parties, recorded on a hide stretched over a wooden shield, the hide being that of the ox slain in the sacrifice by which the oaths were sanctified. This record, written in archaic letters, was preserved at Rome, in the temple of Jupiter Sanctus, (or Sancus,) in the time of Dionysius, and was apparently seen by him.(39)

Polybius recites the contents of three treaties made between

---

(38) iv. 26. See Plin. N. H. vii. 58; Tac. ann. xi. 14; Klotz, ib. p. 245. The alliance between Rome and Latium is described by Livy viii. 4, in the speech of L. Annius Setinus, as having existed more than 200 years, in 340 B.C. The allusion seems to be to the supposed conquest of Latium in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, which ended in 579 B.C. See Livy, i. 38; Dion. Hal. iii. 49—55. The treaty of Cassius would be only 153 years before 340 B.C.

(39) iv. 58. Becker, vol. i. p. 18, thinks that Dionysius means to imply that he saw both these inscriptions. Dionysius, i. 48, says that important oaths and alliances were made at the ara maxima at Rome, which was dedicated to Dius Fidius, or Hercules Sancus. See Hartung, Religion der Römer, vol. ii. p. 44.

Clypeum antiqui ob rotunditatem etiam corium bovis appellarunt, in quo fœdus Gabinorum cum Romanis fuerat descriptum. Paul. Diac. p. 56, ed. Müller. The meaning of which article is that the ancients called the wooden frame on which the hide was stretched for the Gabine treaty, by the name of *clypeus*, on account of its circular form.

The treaty with Gabii is alluded to by Horace as apparently extant in his time, Epist. ii. 1, 24-5. The treaty with the Sabines, also mentioned

Rome and Carthage, which were in his time preserved on brazen plates in the ærarium of the ediles,(40) close to the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter. He states that the earliest of these three treaties was made in the time of L. Junius Brutus and M. Horatius, the first consuls after the expulsion of the kings, by whom the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter was consecrated: that he recites it from the best translation which he was able to make, for so great was the difference between the ancient and the actual language of the Romans, that the persons most versed in the ancient language could scarcely interpret some parts of it, even with close attention. The third treaty was made at the time of the descent of Pyrrhus in Italy. For the second treaty, he specifies no date, but it must have been made at some time between 509 and 281 B.C., the dates of the other two.(41) He adds that the existence of these treaties was unknown to the oldest persons, either Roman or Carthaginian, in his time, and to those most conversant with public affairs; and that therefore it is natural that Philinus, the Agrigentine historian of the First Punic War, should have been ignorant of their contents; but he wonders that Philinus should have described the existence of treaties containing stipulations wholly different from these, and should have charged the Romans with the violation of an engagement into which they had never entered.(42) Polybius then subjoins the provisions of two other treaties made with the Carthaginians after the First Punic War.(43)

There is nothing remarkable in the circumstance that the oldest persons in the time of Polybius were ignorant of treaties which had been made so many years before their time, particu-

---

by Horace, appears to be that with Tarquinius Priscus, in Dion. Hal. iv. 46. Compare Livy, i. 37-8. The treaty with Gabii is considered by Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. 105, to be authentic.

(40) It will be observed that the senatus-consulta were likewise in the custody of the ediles. Above p. 142. Concerning this ærarium, see below, § 9. It was also close to the temple of Saturn.

(41) Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 52, thinks that the undated treaty in Polybius is that mentioned by Livy, vii. 27, as having been made between the Romans and Carthaginians in the year 348 B.C., and as having been renewed for the third time in 306 B.C. (Livy ix. 43.) Compare Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. x. p. 541.

(42) iii. 22—26. See above, p. 39. (43) ib. c. 27.

larly the earliest of the three, which about the year 160 B.C. was three centuries and a-half old: that is to say, it was as far removed from the contemporaries of Polybius as the year 1500 is from us; and even the treaty made in the time of Pyrrhus was more than a century old. It may be remarked, however, that the reference of Polybius to the memory of aged persons, together with his exclusive mention of the foreign historian Philinus, prove that in his time the Romans had no full narrative history of the First Punic War founded upon authentic documentary evidence.

Polybius is so careful and trustworthy a writer, and his description of the state and place of deposit of the earliest of these treaties is so specific, that no doubt can exist of his having examined, copied, and translated the original inscription. His statements respecting the names of the first consuls, and the dedication of the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter do not however quite agree with the accounts of the other historians, (which again differ from one another(44)); and it is to be observed that their names do not occur in the body of the document which he inserts at length. It therefore seems most probable that the date was obtained from some note affixed to the treaty, or some information furnished by the servants of the ediles, and was not a part of the contemporary instrument. His account of the obscurity of the obsolete language of the treaty affords strong evidence of its great antiquity.(45)

Again, Cicero speaks of the treaty made with the Latins in the consulship of Cassius and Cominius, 493 B.C., seventeen years after the expulsion of the kings, as having been engraved on a brazen column behind the rostra, which was only removed in his time.(46)

---

(44) See Fischer, p. 16-7. Below ch. xii. § 2.

(45) Horace alludes to the language of the Saliaric ode being unintelligible in his time.—Ep. ii. 1, 86.

(46) Pro Balbo, 23. The existence of this brazen column (columna ænea) is recognised by Livy, ii. 33. Its contents are recited by Dion. vi. 95. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 18. n. 28. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 23-38, Lect. vol. i. p. 125.

The existence of a written record of the treaty made with Ardea in the year 444 B.C., in the sixty-sixth year of the commonwealth, was attested by Licinius Macer as cited by Livy.(47)

Pliny likewise quotes some writers, as testifying that the treaty granted to the Romans by Porsena, about the year 507 B.C., contained a clause prohibiting them from the use of iron for other purposes than agriculture.(48) Livy explains how a firm peace was made with Porsena;(49) and Dionysius states that a treaty of amity and peace was ratified by mutual oaths;(50) but the terms specified by each are inconsistent with any such ignominious condition as that mentioned by Pliny.

In the year 340 B.C., the rights of Roman citizenship were granted to the Campanian knights, and a record of this grant was made on a brazen plate fixed in the temple of Castor at Rome.(51)

A list of the Roman consuls, lieutenants, quæstors, and military tribunes who plighted their faith for the engagement entered into with the Samnites after the surrender at Caudium, was preserved in the Roman archives.(52)

A constant practice doubtless existed at Rome, from a comparatively early period, of engraving all important treaties on some durable material, and of depositing this record in one of the temples on the Capitol. Thus the terms of the treaty made between the Romans and Ætolians in 210 B.C., were two years afterwards reduced into writing; and one inscription was deposited at Olympia, the other on the Capitol.(53) The treaty made with Antiochus in 189 B.C., was likewise inscribed on brazen tablets, and deposited in the Capitol; where (says Appian) it is customary to deposit the treaties; a copy of it was sent to the consul commanding in Asia, in order that the treaty might be ratified by the proper oaths.(54)

---

(47) iv. 7.

(48) N. H. xxxiv. 39. See below ch. xii. § 5.

(49) Livy ii. 15.

(50) Dion. Hal. v. 34. According to Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. 118, Pliny *saw* the treaty with Porsena.

(51) Equitibus Campanis civitas data, monumentoque ut esset, æneam tabulam in æde Castoris Romæ fixerunt. Livy, viii. 11.

(52) Spoponderunt consules, legati, quæstores, tribuni militum; nominaque omnium qui spoponderunt extant; ubi si et fœdere acta res esset, præterquam duorum fecialium non exstarent; Livy, ix. 5. Livy uses the fact of these names being preserved as an argument to prove that a *fœdus*, or treaty in solemn form, was not made with the Samnites. What he says as to the names of the feciales, proves the existence of an established practice of registration with respect to treaties.

§ 8 Other facts of public interest were likewise recorded in inscriptions on durable materials, which were extant in the Second Punic War, and even at a later time. The earliest inscription of this class, which has been handed down to us, is that mentioned by Livy in connexion with the divergent accounts of the execution of Spurius Cassius in the year 485 B.C. One of these accounts was, that Sp. Cassius was put to death by his father, who dedicated his *peculium* to Ceres, and made of it a statue, with the inscription, EX CASSIA FAMILIA DATUM.(55) Whatever may have been the true account of the death of Cassius, it receives no light from this inscription. Again Livy reports that he received from Augustus Cæsar himself the information that, during his inspection and restoration of the Roman temples, he entered the temple of the Feretrian Jupiter at Rome,(56) which had fallen into decay, and which he caused to be repaired; and that he there saw and read the inscription on the spolia opima, dedicated by A. Cornelius Cossus; it was written on a linen breast-plate, and described him as consul.

---

(53) Hæc convenerunt, conscriptaque biennio post, Olympiæ ab Ætolis, in Capitolio ab Romanis, ut testata sacratis monumentis essent, sunt posita. Livy, xxvi. 24.

(54) Appian, Syr. c. 39. Compare Livy, xxxviii. 38, 39.

Lycortas appeals to the treaty with Rome, engraved on stone. Livy, xxxix. 37.

The map of Aristagoras was engraved on a brass plate; Herod. v. 49. There was at Delphi an ancient copy of the Works and Days of Hesiod, on plates of lead, seen by Pausanias, ix. 31, § 4.

Respecting monumental brasses, which sometimes contained short inscriptions, see Parker's Dict. of Archit. in v.

Iron plates are never mentioned as used for inscriptions. Iron was probably too subject to oxidize, to be fit for the purpose.

(55) ii. 41. According to Pliny, H. N. xxxiv. 9, this was the first brazen statue made at Rome. See below, ch. xii. § 26.

(56) Concerning this temple, see Becker, vol. i. p. 402.

Cossus was consul in the year 428; whereas the account given by all the historians before Livy, and confirmed by the ancient list of magistrates preserved in the temple of Moneta, placed the dedication of the spolia opima by Cossus in the year 437 B.C., when he was only military tribune. A third account represented him as having dedicated these spoils, when master of the horse, in the year 426 B.C.(57)

Again, Livy relates that T. Quinctius Cincinnatus, dictator in 380 B.C., ten years after the capture of the city by the Gauls, took Præneste with eight other towns—and having brought the statue of Jupiter Imperator from Præneste to the Capitol, he dedicated it between the cells of Jupiter and Minerva, placing beneath it a tablet, with an inscription commemorative of his victory. Livy gives the substance, but not the exact words, of this inscription.(58)

The Duilian inscription, recording the naval victory of the Consul Duilius in the First Punic War, 260 B.C., is still in great part extant.(59)

§ 9 Independently of the effects of neglect, indifference, ignorance, and lapse of time, the documents preserved in the Roman archives, even those engraved on brass and other durable materials, were exposed to the casualties which attend such relics of the past, in an unsettled state of society, amidst the destructive influences of civil war or invasion.

The *ærarium* or *tabularium*, connected with the temple of Saturn and also with the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol, was one of the most ancient national archives, and had been so used from an early period. The building was however burnt in the Civil war of Sylla, in the year 83 B.C., and was subsequently restored by Q. Lutatius Catulus, during his consulship, four years afterwards. Some remains of it still exist as the lower part of the Palazzo Senatorio, and the dedication of Catulus was legible in the time of Nardini.(60) We are expressly informed that sacred offerings of metal and other durable materials, as well as the Sibylline prophecies, which were probably written on papyrus, or skins, perished in this conflagration; and it is probable that even inscriptions on brazen tablets shared the same fate.(61)

---

(57) iv. 20.

(58) Dedicatum est inter cellam Jovis ac Minervæ, tabulaque sub eo fixa, monumentum rerum gestarum, his ferme incisa litteris fuit: *Jupiter atque divi omnes hoc dederunt ut T. Quinctius dictator oppida novem caperet.* Livy, vi. 29. Compare Festus in trientem, p. 363. Below, ch. xiii. § 5.

(59) See Ciacconius in Græv. Thes. Ant. Rom. vol. v. p. 1811; Klotz, ib. p. 305; Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 579; Lect. vol. ii. p. 26; Becker, vol. i. p. 323.

When however the Capitol was burnt by the Vitellians in 69 A.D., it is stated to have contained three thousand brazen tablets, which were destroyed by the flames. Vespasian, according to Suetonius, restored this national archive, by procuring copies from all quarters, and made a collection of the senatus-consulta and plebiscita, concerning alliances, treaties, and personal privileges, nearly from the foundation of the city.(62)

---

(60) See Appian, B.C. i. 83; Plut. Public. 12. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 30, 317, 399; ii. 2, p. 351, where the other passages are collected: also, Fischer, p. 185.

(61) 'The Sibylline prophecies (says Dionysius) were preserved until the Marsic war, lying on the ground, in a stone chest, in the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter, in the custody of Decemvirs. When the temple was burnt, either intentionally or accidentally, in the 173rd Olympiad, they were destroyed by the fire with the other sacred offerings;' iv. 62. In the year 389 B.C., Camillus dedicated three golden pateræ from the produce of Etruscan booty: 'quas cum titulo nominis Camilli, ante Capitolium incensum, in Jovis cellâ constat ante pedes Junonis positas fuisse.' Livy, vi. 4. Speaking of the successes of L. Marcius in Spain, in 212 B.C., Livy says: 'Monumentumque victoriæ ejus de Pœnis, usque ad incensum Capitolium, fuisse in templo clypeum, Marcium appellatum, cum imagine Asdrubalis;' xxv. 39. Pliny, N. H. xxxv. 4, says of the same shield: 'Isque clypeus supra fores Capitolinæ ædis usque ad incendium primum fuit.'

After the Sibylline oracles had been burnt in the Marsic war, fresh copies were procured from Samos, Troy, Erythræ, and other places, in and out of Italy. Dion. Hal. ib.; Tac. Ann. vi. 12.

The allusion in Cic. de N. D. iii. 30, to the act of Sosius, and also that in Pro Rabir. perd. reo. c. 3, may be to *any* tabularium, and do not appear to refer to the tabularium on the Capitol.—The seizure of the Capitol by Herdonius in 460 B.C., is not described as having given rise to any destruction of archives, by fire or otherwise.

(62) Vesp. 8. Ærearumque tabularum tria millia, quæ simul conflagraverant, restituenda suscepit; undique investigatis exemplaribus instrumentum imperii pulcherrimum ac vetustissimum confecit, quo continebantur pœne ab exordio urbis senatus consulta plebiscita de societate et fœdere ac privilegio cuicunque concessis. If the last words are to be interpreted literally, the restored archive was limited to a certain class of public documents.

Other conflagrations of buildings are mentioned as having destroyed the records of public instruments. Thus we are told, on the authority of Cato the Elder, that the law relating to the punishment of Vestal virgins for unchastity, which was fixed in the Atrium Libertatis, had, together with many other laws, been destroyed by fire.(63)

We also learn that Clodius burnt the temple of the Nymphs at Rome, in order to destroy the records of the census therein deposited.(64) Other temples likewise, which doubtless contained some ancient records, perished from the same cause; the temple of Mater Idæa was twice burnt, once in 110 B.C., and again in 2 A.D.(65)

Cicero speaks of the Capitol having been struck by lightning in his own time, when the statues both of gods and men were thrown down, and the brazen plates of laws were melted.(66) The Columna rostrata, erected on the Capitol by M. Æmilius in the First Punic War, in commemoration of the naval victory off Cape Hermæum in 225 B.C. was entirely overthrown by lightning in the year 172 B.C.(67) The regia, likewise, the official residence of one of the high pontifical authorities, and likely to contain ancient records, was twice burnt; once in the year 210 B.C.(68) and again in the year 149 B.C.(69)

---

(63) Probrum virginis Vestalis ut capite puniretur, vir qui eam incestavisset verberibus necaretur: lex fixa in atrio libertatis cum multis aliis legibus incendio consumpta est, ut ait M. Cato in eâ oratione quæ de Auguribus inscribitur; Festus, p. 241. See Meyer, Orat. Rom. Fragm. p. 135. Meyer conjectures that this speech was delivered in 196 B.C. The conflagration would therefore have been prior to this year.—Concerning the Atrium Libertatis, see Becker, vol. i. p. 458. Meyer's conjecture is consistent with the supposition that the restoration of the Atrium Libertatis in 194 B.C., mentioned by Livy, xxxiv. 44, was in consequence of the conflagration.

An instance occurs in Livy, xxii. 57, of a vestal being executed for breach of chastity, while her accomplice, L. Cautilius, a scribe of the pontiff, was so severely beaten with sticks by the Pontifex Maximus in the Comitium, that he died under the infliction. This event was 216 B.C., before the destruction of the law by fire. Oppia, a vestal virgin, suffered for incontinence in 483 B.C. Livy, ii. 42.

The Atrium Libertatis seems to have been used as an office by the censors; for the deposit of their papers, and for the accommodation of the public slaves in their service: Livy, xliii. 16.

(64) 'Eum [Clodium] qui ædem nympharum incendit, ut memoriam publicam recensionis, tabulis publicis impressam, extingueret.' Cic. Pro. Mil. 27.

(65) Becker, vol. i. p. 424. It was founded in 191 B.C. A picture with an inscription commemorating the successes of the consul Ti. Sempronius Gracchus in Sardinia, was set up in the temple of Mater Matuta, in the year 174 B.C. The picture represented the shape of the island, with figures of battles; Livy, xli. 33. It was probably a rude pictorial map, on a large scale. A picture recording the exploits of L. Æmilius Paullus, the conqueror of Macedonia, was exhibited by him in some public place. Rerum gestarum ordinem in tabulâ pictum publice posuit. Victor de vir. illust. c. 56. It is also mentioned by Herodotus, that a picture of the bridge of Darius was dedicated in a temple by Mandrocles of Samos, the engineer who constructed it, with an illustrative inscription; iv. 88.

§ 10 The most destructive conflagration to which Rome was exposed, was however that which took place during the Gallic occupation of the year 390 B.C., when the entire city, with the exception of the Capitol, is related to have been burnt. So complete indeed was its destruction, according to our accounts, that the Gauls, during the siege of the Capitol, were afflicted with pestilence from the want of proper dwellings, and after their departure, the Romans were with difficulty prevented by Camillus from abandoning the ruins of their city and migrating in a body to Veii.(70)

---

(66) This event took place in the consulship of Cotta and Torquatus, 65 B.C. Cic. in Catil. iii. c. 8.

(67) Livy, xlii. 20. The aruspices, to whom this alarming prodigy was referred, gave a favourable interpretation of it: 'Aruspices in bonum versurum id prodigium, prolationemque finium et interitum perduellium portendi responderunt; quod ex hostibus spolia fuissent ea rostra, quæ tempestas disjecisset.' Unless there was a recognised meaning for a prodigy which no ingenuity could elude, almost every ominous occurrence admitted of a double interpretation, favourable or unfavourable.

(68) See Livy, xxvi. 27.

(69) Jul. Obsequens, c. 78. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 7—9, 223.

(70) See Livy, v. 42. 'Etsi omnia flammis ac ruinis æquata vidissent. c. 43: quum inter incendia ac ruinas captæ urbis nihil superesse præter armatos hostes viderent.' Plutarch, Camill. 22, says that the Gauls burnt and demolished the town, out of anger that the Capitol was not surrendered. As to the pestilence, see Livy, c. i. 48, and Plut. c. 28; and as to the intention to migrate to Veii, Livy, c. 40; Plut. c. 31. The story respecting the lituus of Romulus proves the existence of a belief as to the total destruction of the city. It was said to have been preserved on the Palatine hill, and to have disappeared during the Gallic occupation, but that after the Gauls had departed, it was found under a thick covering of ashes, unhurt by the fire, although the Curia Saliorum, in which it had been preserved, and everything else near it, had been consumed. Cic. de Div i. 17; Plut. Rom. 22; Camill. 32; Val. Max. i. 8-11; Dion. Hal. xiv. 6. Compare below ch. xii. § 81.

Now we have positive and distinct testimony of ancient writers, that this conflagration destroyed the chief part of all the historical records which Rome then possessed. 'Before this time, (says Livy,) writing was rarely used, by which alone the memory of historical events can be preserved; and such memorials as existed, in the registers of the pontiffs, and in other public and private records, were chiefly destroyed in the conflagration of the city. Henceforth, the history will rest on a more certain foundation.'(71)

Plutarch begins his life of Numa by declaring that there is a great discrepancy in the accounts as to his time, although his descent appears to be carefully deduced. 'But (he proceeds to say) a writer named Clodius, in a work on chronology asserts that the ancient registers disappeared in the destruction of the city by the Gauls, and that those now extant have been falsified, for the purpose of honouring particular persons, by placing them in the first and most distinguished families.'(72) Plutarch alludes again to the uncertainty of the early chronology in his life of Camillus; for, after having stated that the Gauls took Rome rather more than 360 years from the foundation of the city, he adds the expression of a doubt whether an accurate account of the early times can be preserved, when the uncertainty concerning even subsequent events which the confusion of that disaster had produced is borne in mind.(73)

---

(71) Quæ ab conditâ urbe Româ ad captam eandem urbem Romani sub regibus primum, consulibus deinde ac dictatoribus, decemvirisque ac tribunis consularibus gessere, foris bella, domi seditiones, quinque libris exposui; res quum vetustate nimiâ obscuras, veluti quæ magno ex intervallo loci vix cernuntur: tum quod parvæ et raræ per eadem tempora litteræ fuere, una custodia fidelis memoriæ rerum gestarum: et quod etiamsi quæ in commentariis pontificum aliisque publicis privatisque erant monumentis, incensâ urbe pleræque interiere. Clariora deinceps certioraque ab secundâ origine, velut ab stirpibus lætius feraciusque renatæ urbis, gesta domi militiæque exponentur; vi. i. This statement of Livy on this point is cited and adopted by Plutarch de Fort. Rom. c. 13. The infrequent use of writing in the early years of the Republic is also mentioned by Livy, vii. 8, in connexion with the custom of fixing the nail.

(72) Num. i. ἀλλὰ Κλώδιός τις ἐν ἐλέγχῳ χρόνων, οὕτω γάρ πως ἐπιγέγραπται τὸ βιβλίον, ἰσχυρίζεται, &c. It is uncertain what Clodius or Claudius is here meant; but it seems to be the same person as the Κλαύδιος whose χρονικαὶ συντάξεις are cited by Appian, Celt. 3. See Krause, p. 213—6; Leclerc, ib. p. 49; Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 2, identifies the Clodius in Plutarch with Claudius Quadrigarius.

Whoever the writer may be whom Plutarch cites, he is independent of Livy, and probably anterior to him; and his testimony confirms the clear and explicit declaration of Livy, whose good faith on such a point is free from suspicion, while his knowledge, considering the preparation which he had made for his history, admits of no reasonable doubt.(74)

These testimonies may therefore be considered as establishing the two following propositions, both of which are very material with respect to our present inquiry.

1 That little use was made of the art of writing at Rome, for the contemporary registration of historical events, before the year 390 B.C., the date of the capture of the city by the Gauls.

2 That such historical records as existed at the time, whether public or private, for the most part perished in the conflagration of the city.

Niebuhr, indeed, disputes the first of these propositions, and maintains that Livy has confounded the absence of a historical literature with the absence of a contemporary annalistic registration continued by public authority.(75) It is quite true that a wide distinction exists between these two applications of the art of writing to historical purposes: as we may see from the parallel case of Greece; for a registration of names of Argive priestesses, of Olympic victors, of Athenian archons, and of Lacedæmonian kings, began from early periods: but there was no contemporaray narrative history until the times of Hellanicus, Herodotus, and Thucydides, all of whom were born after the year 500 B.C. But even in Greece, the use of writing for the purposes of public historical registration was very limited, at the time to which Livy refers. Thucydides describes the Athenians, in the year 415 B.C. as knowing their history during the Pisistratic period, which was about a century back, only by hearsay accounts, and not from written documents; and the burning of Rome was in 390 B.C., only twenty-five years afterwards. Moreover, the Romans, though an enterprising and warlike people, were at this time far from equal to the Athenians in refinement and mental cultivation; and writing, which was still not in common use at Athens, was, we may be sure, still more rarely employed at Rome. Hence there appears to be no sufficient reason for questioning the accuracy of Livy's statement with respect to the infrequency of writing at Rome before the year 390 B.C.; and we shall see lower down that the character and contents of the extant historical accounts relating to that period are quite consistent with its truth.(76)

---

(73) Camill. c. 22.

(74) On the destruction of manuscripts in the middle ages, and in later times, through wars, fire, neglect, ignorance, and dishonesty, see Maitland, Dark Ages, p. 222—94, ed. 2. 'If the reader has fairly considered the probable effects of wars and fire, aided by the more slow and silent, but incessant operation of Time, assisted by damp and all the auxiliaries which he has employed when the negligence of man has left manuscripts at his mercy—if he has reflected that more than six hundred years have elapsed since the close of that period of which we are now speaking, during all which time the work of destruction has been going on; if he has at all realized these facts, surely I might confidently appeal to him whether it is very far short of a miracle, that any manuscripts of that or of an earlier period should have survived to the present time?' Maitland, ib. p. 276. On the destruction of ancient chronicles, see Palgrave, Hist. of Normandy and England, vol. i. p. 421.

(75) In his Lectures, vol. i. p. v., he says that Livy's statement just cited 'is only half correct, or rather altogether false, and gives us quite an erroneous idea of the early history.' Afterwards, he adds: 'When Livy, speaking of the times previous to the burning of the city, says *per illa tempora litteræ raræ erant*: this is one of those notions, in which he was misled by opinions prevalent in his own age, and which are only partially true.'—p. vi.

---

(76) Below, ch. xii. Various notices of the use of writing occur indeed incidentally in the history prior to the Gallic conflagration. Thus Livy, i. 24, in describing the form of making a treaty under the early kings introduces a formula in which the treaty is represented as engraved on stone or metal, or written on waxen tablets (tabulis cerâve). Forged letters are used by Sextus Tarquin at Gabii, according to Dion. Hal. iv. 57. The story of the treachery of the Vitellii and Aquillii, in the first year of the Republic, involves the seizure of letters to Tarquin, as well as of letters from Tarquin. Livy, ii. 3-4; Dion. Hal. v. 6, 7. The tribune prepares a written copy of his law, in the disturbances at the time of Coriolanus, Dion. Hal. vii. 17. The Romans in the army write letters to their friends, blaming the consul for his incapacity, Dion. Hal. viii. 89. One of the consuls receives a despatch from his colleague—ix. 14. The consul sends a despatch to the Senate, ib. 17, and again 63. The tribunes forge a letter, x. 9. Appius the decemvir sends a letter to the camp, xi. 33; Appius sees Virginia in a school near the forum, Dion. Hal. xi. 28; Livy, iii. 44. A tutor, or schoolmaster, is introduced in the celebrated story of the surrender of

Without assuming that the Romans were, like the Spartans, illiterate upon system, and that they proscribed all literature, even to the art of writing, as inconsistent with the perfection of the soldier-citizen;(77) yet we may be certain that where military virtues and endowments constituted the first title to popular admiration and public honours, the cultivation of letters, in every form, occupied a subordinate position, and filled a very narrow space.(78)

§ 11 We have not however as yet mentioned that class of documents which, if they had been preserved in their integrity, would have afforded the surest foundation and the most valuable assistance, respecting the early period, to the historical inquirer in the Second Punic War. These are the *Annales Pontificum*, also called the *Annales Maximi*. Cicero informs us that, for the purpose of preserving the memory of public events, the Pontifex Maximus, from the beginning of Rome until the pontificate of P. Mucius (131 B.C.), (79) used to commit all the events of each year to writing, to inscribe them upon a whitened tablet, and to exhibit this record in his house, in order that the public might have an opportunity of knowing its contents. These annals, he adds, were still called *Annales Maximi*.(80)

Falerii, Livy, v. 27. Schools are mentioned at Tusculum, Livy, vi. 25; Plut. Cam. 38. It was however easy for later historians, when they framed the history of these early times, to introduce details of this nature.

(77) See Grote, vol. ii. App.

(78) When Scipio was charged with relaxing the severity of military discipline in Sicily, the reading of books was mentioned among his offences: 'Ipsius etiam imperatoris non Romanus modo, sed ne militaris quidem cultus jactabatur, cum pallio crepidisque inambulare in gymnasio, *libellis* etiam palæstræque operam dare.'—Livy, xxix. 19. The following eulogy of Fabius Maximus is placed in the mouth of Cato the Elder, in Cicero's dialogue 'De Senectute;' 'Nec vero ille in luce modo atque in oculis civium magnus, sed intus domique præstantior. Qui sermo! quæ præcepta! quanta notitia antiquitatis! quæ scientia juris augurii! multæ etiam, *ut in homine Romano*, litteræ. Omnia memoriâ tenebat, non domestica solum, sed etiam externa bella.'—c. 4. The expression respecting the literary attainments of Fabius resembles that in Thucydides respecting the eloquence of Brasidas: ἦν δὲ οὐδὲ ἀδύνατος, ὡς Λακεδαιμόνιος, εἰπεῖν. iv. 84.

(79) Publius Mucius Scævola: he was consul in 133 B.C.

(80) Erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio, cujus rei memoriæque publicæ retinendæ causâ ab initio rerum Romanarum usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum, res omnes singulorum annorum man-

The latter appellation was derived from their preparation by the *Pontifex Maximus*, not from their comparative magnitude: it does not appear that there were any other annals of a similar nature.(81) The existence of a record of this kind, made by the Pontifex Maximus, is likewise attested by Cato the Elder.(82)

We learn that a collection of the pontifical annals was made, in later times, for purposes of reference, and was divided into eighty books.(83) A citation from the eleventh book of this collection, made by Verrius Flaccus, in the Augustan age, is preserved by Aulus Gellius.(84)

The duty of keeping the state annals was naturally performed by the Pontifex Maximus, seeing that the entire control and regulation of the calendar, and of the lucky and unlucky days, was vested in the pontiffs.(85) Moreover, the registration of

---

dabat litteris pontifex maximus, referebatque in album, et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi, iique etiam nunc annales maximi nominantur. De Orat. ii. 12. '*Album* (says Niebuhr) is a table or board, covered with gypsum (a proof of the difficulty of finding a suitable writing material), on which the contents of the public documents were painted. Such was the case also with the *edictum prætorium*, and many other documents.' Lect. vol. 1, p. viii. See a fuller explanation of this subject in Leclerc, p. 83-5. Polybius, v. 33, censures some historians of his own time, who, professing to write a general history, relate the war between Rome and Carthage in a few pages: (ἐν τρισὶν ἢ τέτταρσι σελίσιν). 'Some writers, (he then adds) scarcely giving as much information as those who chronicle the political events of the time upon walls, declare that they have included all the transactions both of Greeks and barbarians.' A chronicle, inscribed annually on the plastered wall of a temple or other building, somewhat resembled the Roman annals which were written on an *album*, or whitened board. The chronicles alluded to by Polybius must have been like a painting on fresco—such for instance as that in the Campo Santo at Pisa. It will be observed that the jejuneness of such a chronicle is particularly indicated by Polybius. Compare Leclerc, p. 102, on this passage.

(81) See Macrob. Sat. iii. 2; Festus, p. 126; and Servius cited in note 83.

(82) Gell. ii. 28.

(83) Ita autem annales conficiebantur: tabulam dealbatam quotannis pontifex maximus habuit, in quâ, præscriptis consulum nominibus et aliorum magistratuum, digna memoratu notare consueverat domi militiæque terrâ marique gesta per singulos dies. Cujus diligentiæ annuos commentarios in lxxx. libros veteres retulerunt, eosque a Pontificibus maximis, a quibus fiebant, Annales Maximos appellarunt.—Servius ad Æn. i. 373.

(84) iv. 5.

(85) Livy says, in describing the appointment of the first Pontifex Maximus by Numa: 'Pontificem deinde Numam Marcium, Marcii filium, ex patribus legit, eique sacra omnia exscripta exsignataque attribuit; quibus

prodigies, and of other marks of the divine displeasure, together with their expiatory rites, formed an important part of the function of the national annalist: a duty which would be properly discharged by the chief pontiff.

That an annual register of public events was kept, from an early period until about the time of the Numantine war, by the Pontifex Maximus, is a fact resting on unimpeachable testimony: nor is there any reason to doubt that a voluminous collection of these chronicles was made at a later date. It is, however, more difficult to determine what were the contents of this record, and how far it was preserved in a complete authentic series.

The manner in which these annals were kept, the officer who superintended their preparation, the form in which they were written, and the practice of exhibiting them to the public, would alone suggest the inference that their contents were limited to a naked and unconnected statement of the chief occurrences of the year; to a series of entries, as it were, in a national ledger, without any attempt at a continuous narrative. And such, so far as our information extends, appears to have been their character. Cato characterizes the record of the Pontifex Maximus by saying that it mentions such events as the high price of corn, or an eclipse of the sun or moon.(86) Cicero is express in describing the extreme jejuneness and meagreness of the pontifical annals; and he refuses the name of history, not merely to this official chronicle, but to the early historical writers who, he says, imitated the annalistic style.(87) Quintilian likewise contrasts them with

---

hostiis, *quibus diebus*, ad quæ templa sacra fierent, atque unde in eos sumptus pecunia erogaretur.'—i. 20. Concerning the control of the calendar by the Pontifices, see Goettling, Röm. Staatsverf. p. 179-84. On the functions of the Pontifex Maximus, as to regulating the calendar and preparing the annals, see Bosius de Pontifice Maximo, c. 4, in Græv. Thes. Ant. Rom. vol. v. p. 252.

(86) 'Verba Catonis ex Originum quarto hæc sunt: Non lubet scribere, quod in tabulâ apud pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunæ aut solis lumini caligo aut quid obstiterit.' Gell. ii. 28. See Krause, p. 109.

(87) In the dialogue of the Laws, Atticus says to Cicero, exhorting him to compose history: 'Abest enim historia litteris nostris, ut et ipse intelligo, et ex te persæpe audio . . . . Quamobrem aggredere, quæsumus, et sume ad hanc rem tempus, quæ est a nostris hominibus

the copiousness of a well-written history, as we might speak of a monkish chronicle.(88) Niebuhr assigns this character to the pontifical annals; and he thinks that the short summaries in which Livy, at the end of his tenth and in his subsequent books, describes the appointments of magistrates, and other similar events, may serve to give an idea of their style. He believes that they never entered into the details of battles or of other subjects.(89)

Cicero makes the annual digestion of the Annales Maximi ascend to the foundation of the city; but whatever may be the date from which it began, it is highly improbable that an authentic series of these annals existed in later times, which began before the Gallic conflagration. Livy tells us that most of the public records perished at this time; and if there was so important an exception as a complete series of contemporary national annals, he could scarcely fail to mention it. Hence Goettling, in his History of the Roman Constitution, expresses his opinion that the Annales Maximi were not preserved for the period antecedent to this event.(90) It is even conjectured by Becker, in his work on Roman Antiquities, that the original brazen plates on which the laws of the Twelve Tables were engraved, perished in this conflagration and ruin—and that the copy afterwards set up was a restoration.(91) If a record of so

---

adhuc aut ignorata aut relicta. Nam post annales pontificum maximorum, quibus nihil potest esse *jucundius;* si aut ad Fabium, aut ad eum qui tibi semper in ore est, Catonem, aut ad Pisonem, aut ad Fannium, aut ad Vennonium venias; quamquam ex his alius alio plus habet virium, tamen quid tam exile quam isti omnes?'—i. 2. However ancient the error may be, it seems evident from the context that *jejunius* ought to be read for *jucundius* in this passage. See Krause, p. 24; Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 50; Lect. vol. 1, p. x. The tone of the passage excludes the supposition of irony, to which Leclerc, Des Journaux chez les Romains, p. 31-2, has recourse. See above, p. 40, 97.

(88) Nam rursus quid erat futurum, si nemo plus effecisset eo quem sequebatur? Nihil in poetis supra Livium Andronicum, nihil in historiis supra Pontificum Annales haberemus: x. 2, § 7.

(89) Hist. vol. i. p. 249; Lect. vol. 1, p. x.

(90) p. 175.

(91) Vol. i. p. 27, n. 43. Niebuhr thinks that the original brazen plates of the Twelve Tables were carried away by the Gauls, as was done by the Vandals at a later period when they conquered the city: Lect. vol. 1, p. xxi.

enduring a nature as the Twelve Tables did not survive this calamity, it is not likely that the more perishable annals of the pontiffs should have weathered the storm.

There is likewise another argument against the existence of a complete series of the Annales Maximi from a remote date, upon which Niebuhr not undeservedly lays great stress. Ennius, as quoted by Cicero, spoke of an eclipse of the sun about the year 350 U.C., assigning its natural cause, namely, the interposition of the moon. 'Now,' says Cicero, 'there is so much science and skill in this matter, that from this day, which we perceive to be recorded in Ennius, *and in the Annales Maximi*, all the previous eclipses have been calculated backwards, up to that which occurred on the nones of Quinctilis in the reign of Romulus, when Romulus was really slain in the darkness, though he was fabled to have been taken up into heaven.'(92) Assuming the year 350 U.C. to correspond to the year 404 B.C.—fourteen years before the capture of the city—it would follow that there was no contemporary registration of eclipses before that year: and we observe from this very passage of Cicero that in this year an eclipse of the sun was recorded in the Annales Maximi. Eclipses moreover are particularly specified in the fragment of Cato the Censor—an ancient and unimpeachable witness to such a fact—as among the prominent contents of the pontifical annals;(93) and indeed without any specific testimony, we might safely assume that a prodigy so rare, and so alarming, as a visible eclipse, and one necessarily followed by national expiatory ceremonies, would be duly entered in this public record.(94)

---

(92) Rep. i. 16; cf. ii. 10. Livy attributes the darkness on this occasion to a sudden thunderstorm: i. 16. Dionysius gives the same account: ii. 56; also Ovid, Fast. ii. 493—6; and Eutropius, i. 2; Plut. Rom. 27. and Florus, i. 1, mention both a storm and an eclipse—'Oborta tempestas solisque defectio.' 'Ut easdem tenebras efficiat (Sol) quas effecit in interitu Romuli, qui in obscuratione Solis est factus.' Cicer. in Hortens. ap. Augustin. Civ. Dei, iii. 15. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 520. Below, ch. xi. § 8.

(93) Above, p. 157.

(94) The importance attached in antiquity to eclipses, as omens indicative of the divine will, is so well known as scarcely to require illustration.

Unluckily, however, in this as in other instances, we feel sensibly the defective state of our information respecting a point of early history. We have not the entire passage of Ennius cited by Cicero, and we cannot ascertain to what year he alludes. According to the Varronian era, the year 350 U.C. would correspond to the year 404 B.C.; but we do not know what era Ennius followed. In another part of his 'Annales,' he spoke of the 700th year after the building of the city, though, according to the Varronian date, he wrote about the year 582.(95)

Niebuhr thinks that the allusion is to a solar eclipse, visible in the Mediterranean, which occurred on the 21st of June, in the astronomical year 399 B.C. This eclipse, however, was not visible at Rome, though at Cadiz the middle of the eclipse fell three minutes before sunset. Niebuhr believes that the Romans derived information from Gades, of the day and hour when it occurred; and that this eclipse, visible at the extremity of Spain, but invisible in Italy, is the eclipse alluded to by Ennius.(96)

If this event had occurred during the Second Punic War, it would be conceivable that the Romans might have had precise information respecting the circumstances of an eclipse which was

---

Compare the eclipse of the sun, said to have been predicted by Thales, which put a stop to the battle between the Lydians and Medians; Herod. i 74: the eclipse of the sun, which occurred during the march of Xerxes; Herod. vii. 37: the eclipse of the moon during the siege of Syracuse by the Athenians; Thuc. vii. 50; Grote, vol. vii. p. 432: the eclipse of the sun in the time of Pelopidas; Plut. Pelop. 31: the eclipse of the moon which occurred during Alexander's expedition; Arrian. iii. 7, 6; Curt. iv. 10, the lunar eclipse in the time of Dionysius, Plut. Dion. 24; the solar eclipse of Agathocles, Diod. xx. 5; Justin, xxii. 6, and the lunar eclipse of Sulpicius Gallus, Livy xliv. 37; Frontin. i. 12, § 8, 9. An eclipse of the sun is recorded in Livy, xxxvii. 4, in 190 B.C. Compare Bayle, Pensées diverses sur les Comètes, § 50-3.

(95) See Varro de R. R. iii. 1; Fischer, p. 5; Ritter, in the Rheinisches Museum, for 1843, p. 293; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 408.

(96) Hist. vol. i. p. 251; Lect. vol. 1, p. ix. Niebuhr further supposes that the words of Ennius, 'Nonis Juniis soli luna obstitit et nox,' allude to the obscuration of the sun just before nightfall. This interpretation seems fanciful and far-fetched—*Nox*, in the verse of Ennius, doubtless expresses the darkness caused by the eclipse itself. Niebuhr's argument is in substance adopted by Becker, vol. i. p. 8. Compare Leclerc, p. 88, and Pingré quoted by him.

only just visible at Gades; but that in the year 399 B.C., during the siege of Veii, nine years before the Gallic invasion, they should have known and thought so much about an eclipse in that place, as to afford the subject of an allusion to Ennius more than two centuries afterwards, is utterly incredible. The Romans did not obtain a footing in Spain, or acquire any accurate knowledge of it, until after the First Punic War. No allusion to an eclipse of the sun, about the year 350 U.C., occurs in any of the historians, and therefore it seems impossible to fix the year of the eclipse to which Ennius alludes.

Thus much, however, we may infer from the passage of Cicero; namely, that the eclipses which had taken place at Rome in the first centuries of the city had not been recorded in the pontifical annals, or in any other register, and that, before the time of Cicero, some attempts had been made, with such rude processes as the ancient astronomers were possessed of, to calculate these unregistered eclipses backwards. That the computation was not a scientific one, may be inferred from the attempt to calculate the year in which the eclipse of Romulus occurred—an event wholly fabulous, and apparently not admitted into the most current version of the story of his death or apotheosis.

Another argument of a similar nature, though resting on better ascertained grounds, may be derived from the omission of prodigies in the first decad of Livy, compared with their regular mention in the later extant books, extending from the beginning of the Second Punic War, for fifty-two years, till 166 B.C. That the prodigies reported formally to the state, and expiated by national ceremonies, were regularly entered in the pontifical annals,(97) may be safely inferred from the copious and precise manner in which they are commemorated by Livy, in his later books, together with the religious observances prescribed by public authority for their treatment. Perhaps there was no class of events which was more sedulously noted by the chief pontiff, in his annual chronicle, than the prodigies. Cato, in characterizing the contents of the Annales Maximi, particularly specifies an eclipse as one of the events registered; a distinction for which it is indebted for being a prodigy of a peculiarly alarming and significant nature.

---

(97) In xliii. 13. Livy says: 'Non sum nescius ab eâdem negligentiâ quâ nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credant, neque nunciari admodum ulla prodigia in publicum, neque *in annales* referri.' At the time when Livy wrote, the *Annales Maximi* had been discontinued; by *annales* in this passage, however, he appears to mean some historical record, kept by public officers; though a little further on he applies the same name to his own work.

The following account which Livy gives of the prodigies in the second year of the Second Punic War (217 B.C.), and of the measures adopted with reference to them, will serve to exemplify the manner in which these occurrences were recorded:—

'Many prodigies happened this winter in or near Rome, or (as is generally the case, when the attention of men has been directed to religious events) many were reported, and believed without foundation. Among these were the following: that a male infant of free parents, six months old, cried out 'Triumph,' in the Forum Olitorium;(98) that an ox in the Forum Boarium,(99) mounted of his own accord to the third story of a house, and threw himself down, frightened by the noise of the inmates; that bright appearances of ships were seen in the sky; that the temple of Hope(100) in the Forum Olitorium, was struck by lightning; that at Lanuvium, a spear moved; and that a crow alighted on the temple of Juno, and sat even on the pulvinarium; that in the Amiternian territory, forms of men in white garments were seen at a distance, in many places, and met no one; that a shower of stones fell in the Picene territory; that at Cære, the lots were reduced in size;(101) and that in Gaul, the sword of a guard was drawn by a wolf from the sheath, and carried off. Instructions were given that the Decemvirs should search the Sibylline books with respect to all the prodigies except the fall of stones in the Picene territory; with respect to this last, a nine days' celebration was decreed,(102) and afterwards the whole city was occupied in performing the proper ceremonies for the other prodigies. First of all, the city was purified, and the greater victims were sacrificed to those gods who had been designated. A donation of gold, forty pounds in weight, was carried to the temple of Juno at Lanuvium.(103) The matrons dedicated a brazen statue to Juno on the Aventine. A lectisternium was ordered at Cære, where the lots were reduced in size, and a supplication was prescribed for the goddess Fortuna on Mount Algidus. Also at Rome, a lectisternium was directed to be held for the goddess Juventas, and a supplication at the Temple of Hercules:(104) this last ceremony was afterwards enjoined to the whole people, by name, at all the pulvinaria. Moreover, five greater victims were sacrificed to the god Genius. C. Atilius Serranus, the prætor, was ordered to redeem all the vows, if at the end of ten years the Republic stood uninjured.'(105)

---

(98) On the Forum Olitorium, see Becker, vol. i. p. 600. It was near the Porta Carmentalis, between the Capitol and the river.

(99) See Becker, vol. i. p. 473.

(100) Concerning this temple, see Becker, ib. p. 601.

(101) Livy mentions the same prodigy again, xxii. 1. A deficiency in size was a bad omen, as an excess in size was a good omen: thus the swelling of the fictile chariot in the fire, mentioned by Pliny, H. N. xxviii. 2, and the double loaves of Perdiccas, in Herod. viii. 137, were favourable prognostics. Compare Salmasius, Plin. Exercit. vol. i. p. 487.

Now this record of the prodigies and of the consequent expiations, has all the appearance of having been made when the alarm and the religious impression were fresh in men's minds, and when all the details both of the ominous events, and of the energetic means taken by the state to appease the offended deities, were distinctly remembered. Whether the record was made in the Annales Maximi, we do not know; but this seems to have been the appropriate place for such a memorial, and we may conjecture with probability that it was prepared under the superintendence of the chief pontiff. Now in the period comprised within the first decad of Livy, there are but few mentions of prodigies, and of those which are introduced, some do not bear the character of systematic contemporary registration.

---

(102) See Livy, i. 31, as to the existence of a custom to expiate a fall of *aerolites* by a *novemdiale sacrum*. Compare xxiii. 31; xxvii. 37. Hartung, vol. i. p. 153.

(103) It is difficult to believe that this donation could have been of solid gold.

(104) The nature of a lectisternium and of a supplication is described by Hartung, vol. i. p. 165, 177.

(105) xxi. 62. Concerning the nunciation of prodigies to the Senate, see Gell. iv. 6.

Thus the practice of declaring a vacation of nine days whenever stones fell from heaven is traced to a fall of stones in the reign of Tullus Hostilius:(106) but this is manifestly a fabulous origin for a subsisting religious rite, of which there are so many examples. The sudden deaths and bloody rain at Rome and Laurentum, in consequence of national crimes, which Romulus expiated by ceremonies still celebrated at the Porta Ferentina in Plutarch's time,(107) is another instance of the same style of fiction: an ancient origin is fabricated for a rite existing in a historical age.

The portentous generation of Servius Tullius, and the lambent flame round his head, are parts of the fabulous history of this king—(108) and the same remark applies to the serpent gliding out of an altar or a wooden column, which was seen by Tarquinius Superbus.(109)

The prodigies briefly mentioned by Livy in the years 464 and 461 B.C.—viz., fiery appearances in the sky, an earthquake, a fall of flesh from heaven, and a cow endued with speech—together with their expiatory rites—may perhaps be derived from some contemporary record.(110) A similar origin may be assigned to the notice of earthquakes in 436 B.C.,(111) and of the ceremonies adopted for the mitigation of a pestilence in 399 B.C.(112) The prodigy of the rising of the Alban lake is an event interwoven with the received history of the siege of Veii.(113) But the detailed description of the lights on the Roman spears, in the Sabine war of 503 B.C., given by Dionysius, has all the appearance of arbitrary fiction.(114) A few prodigies are occasionally mentioned by Livy during the period between the capture of the city, and the end of the Samnite wars; but they are not recounted in the copious and regular manner which may be observed in the Second Punic War and subsequently.(115) The brief and occasional notices of prodigies in the first decad of Livy are very unlike the full and detailed accounts, recurring at short intervals, which are to be found in the twenty-five books of his history, beginning in the year 218 B.C.(116) That the latter accounts were derived from a careful contemporary registration, cannot be doubted; and if similar accounts had been extant in Livy's time for the four and a-half centuries comprised in his first decad, it may be fairly inferred that he would not have passed them over in nearly total silence.

---

(106) Romanis quoque ab eodem prodigio novemdiale sacrum publice susceptum est; seu voce cœlesti ex Albano monte missâ (nam id quoque traditur), seu aruspicum monitu. Mansit certe solemne, ut quandoque idem prodigium nunciaretur, feriæ per novem dies agerentur; Livy, i. 31. The story varied as to the source from which the original direction emanated.

(107) *καὶ καθαρμοῖς ὁ Ῥώμυλος ἥγνισε τὰς πόλεις, οὓς ἔτι νῦν ἱστοροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς Φερεντίνης πύλης συντελεῖσθαι.*—Rom. 23. Compare Hartung, vol. i. p. 56.

(108) See Livy, i. 39; Dion. Hal. iv. 2; Florus, i. 6. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 704. A similar prodigy happens to Iulus, when his parents are about to leave Troy.

> Ecce levis summo de vertice visus Iuli
> Fundere lumen apex, tactuque innoxia molli
> Lambere flamma comas, et circum tempora pasci.
> Æn. ii. 682—4.

(109) Ovid. Fast. ii. 711, 2; Livy, i. 56. See below, ch. xi. § 35.

It has been already mentioned that Clodius, the author of a work on Roman chronology, described the early records as having perished in the Gallic conflagration, and as having been afterwards replaced by registers fabricated with the view of doing honour to particular persons. We have likewise cited Cicero's account of the early eclipses having been calculated back from a certain solar eclipse recorded in the Annales Maximi. These testimonies lead to the inference that, after the early annals had been destroyed, or when a demand arose for annals which never had existed, forgeries were executed by which a record of this kind for the early period of Rome was supplied.(117)

---

(110) iii. 5, 10. (111) iv. 21. (112) v. 13, 14.

(113) Livy, v. 15. See below, ch. xii. § 72.

(114) v. 46.

(115) 'No prodigies are mentioned by Livy before the burning of the city by the Gauls. It is true, they are not frequent during the first century after that event; but this only proves that he did not pay any especial attention to them till he had finished the tenth book, *after which, and not till then, he had annals as his sources.* Dionysius likewise describes no prodigies previously to the Gallic conquest.' Niebuhr, Lect. vol. 1, p. xvii.

(116) See Livy, xxi. 62; xxii. 1, 9, 57; xxiii. 31; xxiv. 10, 44; xxv. 7, 16; xxvi. 23; xxvii. 11, 23, 37; xxviii. 11; xxix. 14; xxx. 2, 38; xxxi. 12; xxxii. 1, 9, 29; xxxiii. 26; xxxiv. 45, 55; xxxv. 9, 21; xxxvi. 37; xxxvii. 3; xxxviii. 36; xxxix. 7, 22, 46; xl. 2, 19, 37, 45, 59; xli. 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 26; xlii. 2, 20; xliii. 15; xliv. 18, 37; xlv. 16.

Hence we may safely conclude that the record of the pontiffs relating to events immediately after the death of Romulus, which is quoted by Vopiscus, in the third century after Christ, was of recent manufacture, and was not an ancient genuine document.(118)

Nor can it be believed that the date of the death of Aruns, the son of Tarquinius Priscus, which Dionysius states to have been registered in the annals at the fortieth year of the reign of Servius Tullius, was derived from an authentic contemporary record.(119)

The only distinct citation from the Annales Maximi, upon which reliance can be placed, is that preserved by Gellius from Verrius Flaccus. The passage is of considerable length, and it relates to certain measures, taken on religious grounds, with respect to the position of the statue of Horatius Cocles, which had been struck by lightning. Nothing is known of the circumstances from any other source, nor is the narrative referred to any year. But as the passage is quoted from the eleventh book of the Annales Maximi, and as the collection of them extended to eighty books, we may infer that an early time is in question. The story is told as it would be written some time after the event, and does not bear the appearance of a contemporary entry. Moreover, it ends with a proverbial iambic senarius, such as Terence might have written, literally translated from a verse of Hesiod. Altogether, the passage is inconsistent with the idea of genuine registration or high antiquity; it has much more resemblance to an extract from the antiquarian treatise of a grammarian on the origins of proverbs.(120)

---

(117) The genealogy of himself which Hecatæus the historian related to the priests at Thebes in Egypt, in which he derived his origin from a god in the sixteenth degree, was doubtless fictitious, with the exception of the last two or three generations. Herod. ii. 143. It might have been reduced into writing, or engraved upon stone; like the list of priests of Neptune at Halicarnassus, in Boeckh, Corp. Inscript. Græc. No. 2655, who are traced up to the mythical age.

(118) Tacit. c. i. In the following passage of Varro, the word *annales* seems to signify history in the general sense, and not to refer to the annals of the pontiffs. Et aræ Sabinûm linguam olent quæ Tati regis voto sunt Romæ dedicatæ; nam, ut annales dicunt, vovit Opi, Floræ, &c. De Ling. Lat. v. § 74.

(119) *ἐν ταῖς ἐνιαυσίαις ἀναγραφαῖς*, iv. 30.

The account of the discovery of the books of Numa, in a stone chest, in the year 181 B.C., proves indubitably that documents on the most important subjects could be forged at that time, with the hope of successful deceit, and be attributed to the ancient kings. The circumstances attending this supposed discovery, and its treatment by the Senate, are conclusive evidence that it was a deliberate imposture. Considering the reverence in which Numa and his ordinances respecting religion were held by the Romans of this period, we may be certain that the Senate would not have caused the books to be burnt, if their forgery had not been placed out of all doubt.(121)

---

(120) Gell. iv. 5. Below ch. xii. § 5.

The writer of the short work entitled 'Origo Gentis Romanæ' (commonly attributed to S. Aurelius Victor), cites the fourth book of the Pontifical annals as an authority for the marvellous return of the images of the Penates from Alba to Lavinium: 'Itaque tertio nemo ausus est amovere ea, ut scriptum est in Annali Pontificum iv., lib. Cincii et Cæsaris ii., Tuberonis i.,' c. 17. (Compare Dion. Hal. i. 67.) Afterwards, in the same chapter, of Silvius: 'Ejusdem posteri omnes cognomento Silvii usque ad conditam Romam Albæ regnaverunt, ut est scriptum Annalium Pontificalium libro quarto.' Again, in c. 7, he cites the 'Libri Pontificalium' for the arrival of Hercules in Italy—'At vero in libris Pontificalium traditur Hercules,' &c., and in c. 9, 'Cæsar Pontificalium lib. i.,' is adduced as an authority for the derivation of the name Misenus from a companion of Æneas. In c. 18, Aremulus Silvius, King of Alba, is said to have been hurled by lightning into the Alban lake, 'ut scriptum est annalium lib. vi. et epitomarum Pisonis ii.' In c. 22 'lib. ii. Pontificalium' is cited as an authority for a circumstance in the story of Romulus and Remus. If these are to be taken as specimens of the contents of the Pontifical annals, they may be put on a par with the mythological works of Hecatæus, Pherecydes, and the Greek logographers.

Lachmann, de Font. Liv. i. p. 33, promised a defence of this work; but it does not appear that the promise was performed. It has been considered a modern forgery by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. note 274, Lect. vol. i. p. xi., and other critics of authority. See above, p. 73, and Leclerc, p. 46. Even assuming it to be a genuine work of the later antiquity, the extracts from the Annales Pontificum are justly regarded by Schwegler as suspicious.

In his History, Niebuhr expresses an opinion that the series of Annales Maximi, which was anterior to the Gallic conflagration, was destroyed by that disaster.(122) In his Lectures, moreover, he conjectures that the copy used by Livy did not begin until the year 460 U.C. He founds this inference upon the last chapter of Livy's tenth book, the details of which appear to be derived from the Annales Maximi; and he argues with probability, that if Livy had had similar information for previous years, he would not have failed to introduce it into his history.(123)

It is difficult, on indirect and negative grounds, to arrive at a certain conclusion with respect to the preservation of the Roman annals; but it may be stated, as the result of the scanty information which we possess on this subject, that the positive testimony as to the effects of the Gallic conflagration, renders it probable that the chief part of the Annales Maximi, and other ancient records, perished on that occasion; while the character of the historical narratives handed down to us by the ancient historians, not only for the period until that event, but for the subsequent period to the end of the Samnite wars—their uncertainty, and the discrepancies of evidence as to material facts—seem inconsistent with the supposition that the writers who framed it had before them a complete authentic record of events, framed year by year, under the direction of public officers, and subject to the check of contemporaneous publicity. However dry and meagre, as compared with the work of an accomplished writer, we may suppose such a record to have been, yet it would have furnished a complete skeleton of accurate and authentic history; and in particular, if preserved in a complete state, it would have prevented all uncertainty and conflict of testimony as to the names of the annual magistrates, and other similar facts, as to which, at the time, no doubt could have existed.(124)

---

(121) See Livy xl. 29. Pliny N. H. xiii. 27, and the other writers cited in Schwegler, vol. i. p. 564—8, who agrees with Hartung, vol. i. p. 214, in treating these writings as apocryphal. Niebuhr, on the other hand, thinks that the books were buried in very early times. Hist. vol. i. p. 506. The brazen tablets found by the father of Acusilaus in his house, from which he wrote his work on genealogies, were doubtless fictitious: *ἔγραψε δὲ γενεαλογίας ἐκ δέλτων χαλκῶν, ἃς λόγος εὑρεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, ὀρύξαντά τινα τόπον τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ*, Suid. in *Ἀκουσίλαος*. Suetonius likewise has a story of a prophecy of Julius Cæsar's assassination being found on a brass plate in the tomb of Capys, the mythical founder of Capua, Cæs. 81. Mr. Ford (Handbook of Spain, vol. i. p. 390) gives an account of a forgery of relics of bones of a saint, accompanied with the burial of leaden vessels and writing, by two Spanish impostors, in 1588, which deceived the Archbishop of Castro. The spots where they were discovered are marked by crosses, and a college was founded on their site. Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism, likewise professed to have transcribed the Book of Mormon from a set of gold plates engraved with mysterious characters, which he dug up in a place revealed to him by an angel. See Ed. Rev., vol. xcix. p. 323.

(122) Hist. vol i. p. 250. The same opinion recurs, Lect. vol. i. p. 4.

(123) Lect. vol. 1, p. x. According to Fischer, the year of Gurges and Scæva (that referred to by Niebuhr) is 462 U.C. = 292 B.C.

§ 12 Besides the annals kept by the chief pontiff, which were exhibited to the public view, there were certain memorials or records of sacred law, and other legal customs, which were preserved by the pontiffs, the augurs, and other sacred corporations. These are called by the general name of *commentarii* and *libri pontificum*,(125) in addition to which more special names sometimes occur. Regulations on religious matters are quoted from these books—such as the description of the victims proper to be sacrificed on certain occasions,(126) and of the holidays on which water could be turned upon a meadow:(127) or the rule that the bodies of persons who hung themselves were not to be buried.(128) The books of the augurs are cited for the fact that the dictator was anciently called by the title of 'Magister populi:'(129) and Cicero declares that the books of the pontiffs and the augurs attest that there was an appeal to the people from the kings.(130) That the pontiffs had from an early time formed

---

(124) The best account of the 'Annales Maximi' is in Becker, vol. i. p. 4—11, and Schwegler, vol. i. p. 7—12. The long dissertation of Leclerc, 'Des Annales des Pontifes, ou Grandes Annales,' prefixed to his work 'Des Journaux chez les Romains,' p. 1—178—with the fragments, p. 344—78 —is useful as a collection of passages bearing on the subject, but it is uncritical and inaccurate, and can only mislead the general reader. The writer, by attributing a specific sense to the generic term *annales*, and applying to the annals of the pontiffs what is affirmed of history generally, perverts a large number of passages from their true meaning, and confuses the whole subject. See further, Göttling, Röm. Staatverf. p. 174; Hartung, Die Religion der Römer, vol. i. p. 211.

(125) Livy speaks of the Commentarii Pontificum as having perished in the Gallic conflagration, vi. 1. Canuleius likewise complains that the plebeians were excluded from the Commentarii Pontificum, iv. 3. *Commentarius* means a memoir, memorial, note, or memorandum. Hence it may be applied to historical memoirs, such as those of Julius Cæsar, whose two works are entitled *Commentarii*. It was also used to signify notes or

---

heads of a speech, made in order to assist the memory. See Cic. Brut. 44. Quintilian Inst. Orat. x. 7, § 30, 31.

In the sense of memoir it is equivalent to the Greek ὑπομνήματα. (Dion. i. 74; Gell. xiv. 3.) It may also be applied to the records and minutes made by public officers: in this sense we must understand the *Commentarii Censorum*, which are equivalent to *tabulæ censoriæ* (see Becker, vol. i. p. 25, and Dion. Hal. ibid). *Commentarius* was also used for a memorandum or note, drawn up for a person's private use: thus Livy says that when Demetrius appeared before the Roman Senate in 183 B.C., for the purpose of defending his father Eumenes, and, on account of his youth and agitation, was unable to make a clear statement of his father's case, the Senate, pitying his embarrassment, 'Quæri jussit ab eo, ecquem de his rebus *commentarium* a patre accepisset?' When he answered this question in the affirmative, they asked him to produce the document, and permitted him to read it: xxxix. 47. Again, Eumenes brought with him to Rome, in 173 B.C., a memorandum, which he had written respecting the preparations for the war:—'Commentarium ferens secum, quod de apparatibus belli omnia inquirens fecerat:' ib. xlii. 6. After Philip had been defeated at Cynoscephalæ, in 197 B.C., he sent to burn the *commentarii regii* at Larissa:—'Missis Larissam ad commentarios regios comburendos, ne in hostium venirent potestatem:' xxxiii. 11. This, translated into modern language, means that the king gave orders to have all his papers and manuscripts burnt, lest they should fall into the enemy's hands.

When Livy, i. 60, speaks of consuls being created 'ex commentariis Servii Tullii,' he probably alludes to some directions supposed to have been found among the manuscripts of that king. Compare Livy, i. 68; Becker, ii. i. p. 3; Leclerc, p. 128. In later times, the registrar or keeper of public acts was called a *commentariensis*.

(126) Festus, p. 189. 'Ita est enim in commentariis pontificum: augurio canario agendo dies constituantur, priusquam frumenta vaginis exeant, et antequam in vaginas perveniant.' Plin. N. H. xviii. 3.

(127) Serv. Georg. i. 271; Macrob. Sat. i. 16.

(128) Serv. Æn. xii. 603.

(129) Cic. Rep. i. 40; Sen. Epist. 108, § 30; Varro, de L. L. v. § 82, merely mentions this use of the term, without citing any authority. Becker, ii. 2. p. 173, thinks that *dictator* was the later secular name, which was not recognised in the ritual books: see, however, below, ch. xii. § 9.

(130) Provocationem autem etiam a Regibus fuisse declarant pontificii libri, significant etiam nostri augurales. De Rep. ii. 31. Cicero's words seem to imply that this fact appears plainly in the former, and is intimated in the latter.

imperfect collections of precedents and rules of consuetudinary law—something like the old French *coutumes*—is highly probable. The disclosures made by C. Flavius—to which we have already adverted—show that these collections were not confined to the law concerning sacred things, but extended to all forms of actions, and to the general rules of civil jurisprudence.(131) In early times they were reserved for the patricians alone, and were withheld from the plebeians.(132)

Dionysius describes the Romans, prior to the decemviral legislation, as having had no written laws, but only unwritten customs;(133) there were at that time, he says, only a very few written ordinances, having the force of law; and these were contained in sacred books, known only to the patricians.(134)

The books of the pontiffs are however expressly mentioned by Livy among the records, which for the most part perished in the Gallic conflagration; and it seems improbable that the entry respecting the appeal from the kings was a contemporaneous note, or was anything more than a traditionary reminiscence of the regal period reduced into writing at a later date.

A similar remark applies to other relics of old constitutional law and practice, which Livy refers to the period of the kings (such as the formula in trials for treason, as well as those of the *pater patratus* for the execution of a treaty, and of the feciales for the surrender of a city,) and which Niebuhr supposes to have been derived from the books of the pontiffs and augurs. The conjecture which Niebuhr makes as to the contents of these books is probably not far from the truth. 'We can only conceive them (he says) to have been collections of traditions, decisions, and decrees, laying down principles of law by reporting particular cases.'(135) It may be reasonably supposed that Livy obtained his accounts of the ancient usages in question, either directly or indirectly, from some such collections or digests as Niebuhr describes; but there is no sufficient ground for believing that they were referred on historical grounds, and upon authentic contemporary evidence, to the times and occasions with which Livy connects them.

---

(131) See above, § 1. Concerning the origin of the religious records of the pontiffs and other sacred functionaries, see Hartung, vol. i. p. 212.

(132) Canuleius, in 445 B.C., complains that the plebeians are excluded from the Fasti, and the Commentarii Pontificum. Livy iv. 3. To the former they were admitted by the act of Flavius.

(133) *ἄγραφοι ἐθισμοί*, x. 57. On the meaning of the term *ἄγραφα νόμιμα* or *ἔθη*, see Treat. on Pol. vol. ii. p. 27.

(134) x. 1.

Dionysius, in treating of the foundation of Rome, remarks that there is no ancient Roman historian; but each writer derived his information from ancient stories preserved in sacred books.(136) What these sacred books were, however, he does not inform us. In the story of Coriolanus, he cites the books of the augurs as evidencing two personal appearances of the goddess Fortuna Muliebris :(137) and he cites the testimony of the 'sacred and reserved books,' for the magistrates of the year 444 B.C.(138) Whatever the sacred books alluded to by Dionysius may have been, there is no probability that they were copious or minute before the burning of the city by the Gauls, or that many of them escaped that catastrophe.

§ 13 In addition to the annals and registers kept by the pontiffs, there were likewise some ancient records, containing the names of the annual and other magistrates, which would have been highly valuable as furnishing an authentic chronological basis for a historical narrative; but they were probably not complete and consecutive.(139) Among these were some registers written on linen (libri lintei), which were preserved in the temple of Juno Moneta on the Capitol. They are first mentioned under the year 444 B.C., by Livy, who says that L. Papirius Mugillanus and L. Sempronius Atratinus are noted as consuls for the year in the treaty with Ardea, and in the linen books at the temple of Moneta, though they are not mentioned in the ancient histories, or in the books of magistrates.(140) The same linen records are quoted for the names of the consuls in 434 and 428 B.C.,(141) and for that of the præfectus annonæ in 440 B.C.(142) It will be here observed, that *lintei libri* are only quoted for the period of sixteen years, from 444 to 428 B.C.

---

(135) Hist. vol. i. p. 346. (136) i. 73.

(137) viii. 56. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 12, note 18.

(138) xi. 62. *πιστεύοντες ταῖς ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν τε καὶ ἀποθέτων βίβλων μαρτυρίαις.*

(139) Livy, vi. 41, alludes to a register of the years of the kings in the Capitol.

That there were, however, lists of magistrates in the later years of the Republic, extending up to the time of the kings, cannot be doubted, though we cannot now ascertain at what time, or from what materials they were constructed. Livy cites the books of the magistrates for the name of a tribune of the people, and the day when he entered his office, in the year 183 B.C.;(143) at this time there was doubtless an authentic contemporary register of the magistracies. Copious fragments of a list of this sort, comprising the consuls and other high magistrates, as well as of the triumphs, engraven on marble plates, have been discovered at Rome, and are now preserved in the Capitol, whence they have acquired the name of Fasti Capitolini. This chronological register was probably compiled in the time of Augustus or Tiberius, from extant lists similar to those consulted by Dionysius, Livy, and the other historians of that age.(144) A collection of *Fasti*, which appear to have related in part to the ancient chronology of his country, was made by M. Fulvius Nobilior, the contemporary of Cato the Censor, and of Ennius, and deposited by him in the temple of Hercules and the Muses.(145) A chronological work, which included a list of the Roman magistracies, was likewise compiled by Atticus.(146) The inconsistencies and uncertainties of the Fasti, as reported by our extant historians, not only for the period anterior to the capture of the city, but also for that included between this epoch and the war of Pyrrhus, prove that in the literary age of Rome there was no one complete chronological list of magistracies, for the first four and a-half centuries, which was universally received as authentic.

---

(140) iv. 7.

(141) iv. 20, 23. In these three cases, Livy cites the *libri lintei*, on the authority of Licinius Macer. In the latter case, Q. Tubero differs from Macer as to the names in this register.

(142) iv. 13. Concerning the temple of Juno Moneta, see Becker, vol. i. p. 392.

The inscription on the *linteus thorax* among the spolia opima of Cossus (above, p. 147), is another example of writing on linen. An ancient sacred book, written upon linen, is described as used by the Samnites, in Livy, x. 38. (293 B.C.)

(143) xxxix. 52.

(144) See Laurent, Fasti Consulares Capitolini. Altonæ: 1833. Concerning the authority of the triumphal fasti, see Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii note 579; vol. iii. p. 200.

Dionysius says, that in the registers of the censors, which are religiously handed down in the censorian families from father to son, he had found that in the second year before the taking of the city, a census had been instituted, to which (as to the others) a note of the time was appended, in the following words:—'In the consulship of Lucius Valerius Potitus and Manlius Capitolinus, in the 119th year after the expulsion of the kings.' Hence it follows, adds Dionysius, that the Gallic invasion took place after 120 complete years from the same epoch.(147)

If we suppose that the entry of the date of this census was contemporaneous with the event, and that the period of 119 years was then obtained from authentic numeration, it would follow that we have a trustworthy chronology from the expulsion of the kings to the capture of the city. It will be observed that Dionysius describes himself as having himself seen these censorial records.(148) Whatever may have been the antiquity of these censorial records, they could not have been handed down in censorial families before the year 443 B.C., sixty-seven years after the expulsion of the kings; because the office of censor itself was only created in that year.(149)

---

(145) Macrob. Sat. i. 12, § 16, with the note of Janus. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 612, and other passages in Krause, ib. p. 125-0. Meyer, Orat. Rom. Fragm. p. 53.

(146) Moris etiam majorum summus imitator fuit, antiquitatisque amator: quam adeo diligenter habuit cognitam, ut eam totam in eo volumine exposuerit, quo magistratus ornavit. Nulla enim lex, neque pax, neque bellum, neque res illustris est populi Romani, quæ non in eo suo tempore sit notata; et, quod difficillimum fuit, sic familiarum originem subtexuit, ut ex eo clarorum virorum propagines possimus cognoscere. Nepos, Att. 18.

(147) i. 74. The year is 392 B.C.

(148) His expression i ἐν οἷς εὑρίσκω, &c. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. note 144.

Another fact which Dionysius cites from the records of the censors, viz., the number of persons included in a census of King Servius, stated by him as 84,700,(150) seems to be a reflex fiction, and not to be entitled to any credit. Whether the numbers of the citizens, stated at various intervals in the early ages of the Republic to have been ascertained by an official census, are authentic, is a question for the determination of which there are no satisfactory data.(151)

A long extract from the censorian records is given by Varro. It consists of rules of practice with respect to the performance of the formal duties of the censor. A similar extract from the consular records is subjoined, containing directions respecting forms of the consul's office.(152) These extracts doubtless afford a correct idea of the practical manuals—containing the rules of procedure for the several high magistrates—which were prepared by the official diligence of the pontiffs and scribes, and which occasionally furnished information, on legal and constitutional antiquities, to the historian.

---

(149) Concerning the *tabulæ censoriæ*, the official documents of the censors, see Becker, ii. 2, p. 206, 7. Compare Niebuhr, Hist., vol. ii. p. 3, 406.

(150) iv. 22. *ὡς ἐν τοῖς τιμητικοῖς φέρεται γράμμασιν.*—Compare Livy, i. 44.

(151) The numbers of the census for the period anterior to the capture of the city, are considered by Niebuhr as authentic. Hist. vol. i. p. 552; vol. ii. p. 68—70. Dr. Arnold, however, takes a different and more probable view. 'I am inclined to suspect (he says), that the actual tables of the census, before the invasion of the Gauls, perished in the destruction of the city; and that they were afterwards restored from the annalists, and from the records of different families, as was the case with the Fasti Capitolini. If this were so, different annalists might give different numbers, as they also give the names of consuls differently, and exaggeration might creep in here, as in the list of triumphs, and with much less difficulty. For although Niebuhr's opinion is no less probable than ingenious, that the returns of the census include the citizens of all those foreign states, which enjoyed reciprocally with Rome each other's franchise, still the numbers in the period under review, seem inconsistent, not only with the common arrangement of the events of these years, but with any probable arrangement that can be devised. . . . I am inclined, therefore, to think that the second pretended census of the commonwealth, taken by the dictator T. Lartius, which gives an amount of one hundred and fifty thousand seven hundred citizens within the military age, is a mere exaggeration of the annalist or poet, whoever he was, who recorded the acts of the first dictator.'—Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 131.

(152) Varro de L. L. vi. § 86—8. The first is taken from the *Censoriæ tabulæ*, the latter from the *Commentarii consulares*. There is likewise a third extract, of a similar character, which appears to relate to the quæstor's duties.—ib. § 91, 2. On these registers, see Becker,

The antique practice of driving a nail in a wall, as a chronological record, is a rude and imperfect contrivance, indicative of a great penury of writing materials, and of the infrequent use of writing. Livy states that in the year 363 B.C., twenty-seven years after the capture of the city, a dictator was appointed for the special purpose of fixing the nail, in the belief that this ceremony would mitigate a pestilence under which Rome was then suffering. There was (says Livy) an ancient law directing that the chief officer of the state should drive a nail on the Ides of September. This nail was fixed on the right side of the temple of Jupiter, towards the temple of Minerva. The nail (he adds) is said to have been a mark of the number of years, because writing was rarely used at that time; and the law was believed to be dedicated to the temple of Minerva, because numbers were the invention of Minerva.(153) And he quotes the testimony of Cincius for the fact, that a series of nails were extant in the temple of Nortia at Volsinii, as a register of successive years. The temple of Jupiter, in which these nails were fixed, was dedicated soon after the expulsion of the kings, and the 'chief officer' (Prætor Maximus) who drove the nail was, as Livy tells us, first a consul, and afterwards a dictator;(154)

---

vol. i. p. 25. As to the instructions on official duties, see Becker, ii. 2, p. 10. There were practical treatises on the forms and procedure of the Senate: Becker, ii. 2, p. 386, n. 998.

(153) Æschylus assigned the invention of numbers to Prometheus. Prom. 259: Sophocles, to Palamedes, Fragm. 379. ed. Dindorf.

(154) Livy, vii. 3; ii. 8. Compare Becker, ii. 2, p. 89, n. 177. The explanation of this custom devised by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 266—280, seems to be far-fetched, unsupported by evidence, and inconsistent with the account of Livy. It is not adopted by Müller, Etrusker, iv. 7, § 6, who shows that the Italian peasants registered years in the same way. Compare likewise, Paul. Diac. p. 56, Müller. Clavus annalis appellabatur, qui figebatur in parietibus sacrarum ædium per annos singulos, ut per eos numerus colligeretur annorum. Göttling, Röm. Staatsverfassung, p. 180, n. 5, says that two of the brazen nails used for marking the years, with a representation of the moon upon them, are

so that the ancient law of which he speaks, must be subsequent to the regal period.

A similar resort to the practice of appointing a dictator in order to fix the nail was had in the years 331 and 313 B.C., but in both cases with a merely religious view as a national piacular ceremony.(155) At this time therefore the practice had lost its original meaning; it was no longer intended to serve as a chronological record, but it was the remnant of an old custom, the substance of which had passed away, while its form was retained and applied to a religious purpose. At the time, however, when the law was enacted, the nail was doubtless intended, as Livy says, to mark the year, and the piacular effect of the solemnity had not been thought of.

If there had been any authentic and complete list of the annual magistrates, faithfully registered year by year, which was extant in the Augustan age, we should not find the discrepancies as to their names and dates which occur in the ancient writers. Still less, can we suppose that there was a brief contemporary official history, in the form of Annales Maximi, preserved from the foundation of the city, when we consider the irreconcilable inconsistencies in the narratives of the various historians, and the internal improbability of a large part of their accounts.(156)

---

preserved: one was in the possession of the late Baron v. Stackelberg, the other is in the Vatican collection.

(155) See Livy, viii. 18; ix. 28.

(156) Cn. Flavius, when he was curule ædile, erected a brazen chapel in the Græcostasis, near the Comitium, which was defrayed from money produced by fines imposed on usurers. In this chapel he placed an inscription, engraved on a brazen tablet, declaring that this temple was dedicated 204 years after the Capitoline temple. Hence Pliny infers that the temple of Flavius was erected in 449 U.C. Plin. N. H. xxxiii. 6; and respecting the site of the temple, Becker, vol. i. p. 289. The accounts of the dedication of the Capitoline temple are not quite consistent, but if we assume the date of Livy, 245 U.C. 509 B.C., we have for the date of the temple of Flavius, 449 U.C. 305 B.C., which agrees with the date of Pliny, and is within one year of Livy's date for the edileship of Flavius—450 U.C. 304 B.C. (Livy, ix. 46.) It seems certain that we must read 'cciv. annis' in Pliny. Dr. Arnold justly remarks that 'this is a very important passage for the chronology of Rome; for it declares that the consulship of P. Sempronius and P. Sulpicius, the last year of the Second Samnite War, was believed by those who were then living, and by one who had access to all existing monuments, to have been the 204th year from the beginning of the commonwealth.'—vol. ii. p. 299.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE PRIVATE MEMORIALS, AND HISTORICAL POEMS OF ROME, FOR THE PERIOD BEFORE THE WAR WITH PYRRHUS.

§ 1 IN the preceding chapter we have examined the sources of the early Roman history, so far as they were of a public and official character: so far as they were documents prepared by the magistrates, pontiffs, and servants of the Roman state. We now pass to another class of memorials; namely, records made by private unauthorized writers, and not by public officers in the exercise of their duties. The latter memorials, however, not less than the former, must be understood to relate to matters of public and historical interest.

The sources of early Roman history, springing from private hands, which will be included in the present chapter, may be divided into five heads, viz. 1, Deliberative Speeches. 2, Funeral orations. 3, Family memoirs. 4, Annals and documents of neighbouring states. 5, Poems. We will now proceed to treat of these in their order.

The practice of reporting speeches from short-hand notes, taken while the orator was speaking, did not begin in Rome until the latter years of the Republic. Before that time, speeches were only preserved when they were reported by the orators themselves. The ancient orators were in the habit of composing their speeches beforehand, and of delivering them from memory. It was therefore easy to publish a speech which had been carefully composed, and already existed in writing. The orations of Cicero, as we have them, were all published by himself: some of them were never delivered, and many of those which had been delivered were doubtless given to the world in an improved version.(1) That the number of speeches which had been published by their authors was very considerable in the time of Cicero, may be seen from the sketch of Roman oratory in his dialogue of Brutus. The earliest Roman statesman, however, who published a long series of his orations, was Cato the Elder; 140 of his speeches had been read by Cicero,(2) and Meyer, the diligent editor of the Fragments of the Roman Orators, has been able to recover traces of not less than ninety-three.(3) Before his time only five Romans are known to have left any of their orations in writing. Q. Cæcilius Metellus, who was consul in 206 B.C., published his funeral oration upon his father L. Cæcilius Metellus,(4) and M. Claudius Marcellus left a similar monument to the memory of his father, who was distinguished in the Second Punic War.(5) A record was also preserved of the speech made by the great Scipio against Nævius the tribune of the people, upon the charge of having taken bribes from Antiochus.(6) Fabius Maximus likewise put in writing the funeral oration which he pronounced upon his son, and gave it to the public.(7) The earliest oration which was extant at the close of the Republic, and with which Cicero and his successors were acquainted, was the oration of Appius the Blind, in the Senate, on the celebrated occasion of the embassy of Cineas, respecting peace with Pyrrhus. (280 B.C.) Appius, as is well known, succeeded in diverting the Senate from their disposition to make terms with the invader, and in persuading them to reject his proposals. Some account of the contents of this speech is given by Plutarch and Appian; but an authentic report of the original was certainly preserved in antiquity.(8)

---

(1) See Becker, vol. i. p. 47, concerning the reporting of Cicero's speeches.

(2) Brut. c. 17.

(3) Meyer, Orat. Rom. Fragm. p. 11. (4) Ib. p. 10.

(5) Ib. p. 9. (6) Ib. p. 5.

(7) *τὸ δ᾽ ἐγκώμιον, ὃ ταῖς ἐκκομιδαῖς τῶν ἐπιφανῶν οἱ προσήκοντες ἐπιτελοῦσιν, αὐτὸς εἶπε καταστὰς ἐν ἀγορᾷ, καὶ γράψας τὸν λόγον ἐξέδωκεν*—Plut. Fab. 24. It was extant in Cicero's time; De Sen. 4. See Meyer, p. 4. It was delivered between the years 213 and 203 B.C., the former of which was the year of his son's consulship, the latter of his own death.

(8) Meyer, p. 1. Above, ch. ii. § 10.

Appius the Blind was born about 354 B.C., and Demosthenes was born about 385 B.C. The earliest Greek orations which are now extant, and probably the earliest which were extant in antiquity, are those of Andocides, who was born in 467 B.C. Considering the priority of the Greek literature, it is natural that the Romans should not have had any speech of earlier date than that of Appius; and as they were a practical business-like people, it is equally natural that their earliest prose composition should have been the report of a speech delivered in the Senate upon a question of great public interest.(9) It does not however appear that the example which he set produced many imitators, for the funeral orations of Fabius, Marcellus, and Metellus, which are next to the speech of Appius in order of time, were not delivered till sixty or seventy years afterwards.(10)

The speeches in the historians, as Dionysius and Livy, which are referred to the times anterior to Appius, were not preserved by any independent record, and must be considered in connexion with the histories of which they form an integral and important part.

§ 2 The custom of pronouncing laudatory orations, at public funerals, to the memory of those who had died in the field, existed at Athens from the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, and probably from an earlier period. The funeral oration of Pericles, delivered at the end of the first year of the Peloponnesian war, on an occasion of this sort, has been immortalized by Thucydides, who likewise describes the ceremonies with which it was accompanied. The bones, having previously been laid in public under a tent, were brought in cypress chests, one for each tribe, upon chariots, and were attended by the kindred, male and female. The burial took place in a suburb of the city; and on this occasion a citizen, eminent for his station and ability, pronounced a discourse over them.(11) In Rome, from an early time, a similar practice had prevailed, though in a different form. Instead of the memory of persons who had been killed in the service of their country being honoured by a collective eulogy, the funerals of eminent citizens were accompanied by an oration, destined to the commemoration of their individual merits. When a distinguished Roman was about to be buried, his body was brought to the rostra, and placed in a conspicuous position, in the midst of the people. Hereupon, one of his sons, if his age was sufficient, or some other kinsman, delivered a panegyric upon his character and exploits; and afterwards eulogized the achievements of any eminent persons who might be present, beginning with the oldest. In this manner, says

---

(9) Niebuhr, Lect. vol. iii. p. 134, remarks that 'prose was cultivated and developed throughout antiquity by public speaking and oratory.' Hence, he says, prose naturally degenerated under the empire, when freedom of speech had come to an end. Cicero attributes the cultivation of eloquence and of a good style of composition among the Romans entirely to the desire of excelling in public oratory. 'Nemo enim studet eloquentiæ nostrorum hominum, nisi ut in causis atque in foro eluceat: apud Græcos autem eloquentissimi homines, remoti a causis forensibus, quum ad ceteras res illustres, tum ad scribendam historiam maxime se applicaverunt.' De Orat. ii. 13. He then proceeds to show that Herodotus, Thucydides, Philistus, Theopompus, Ephorus, Xenophon, and other Greek historians, had no forensic habits.

(10) Compare Klotz, Lat. Litt. p. 354, n. 487.

---

(11) Thuc. ii. 34, describes the public funeral given at Athens to those citizens who fell in battle, and the funeral oration which was held by some eminent person, chosen by the state, over their remains. This ceremony took place according to law—τῷ πατρίῳ νόμῳ χρώμενοι, and was continued throughout the Peloponnesian war. Diod. xi. 33, states that the Athenian custom of delivering a funeral oration over the citizens who had fallen in war, originated after the battle of Platæa. Dion. Hal. v. 17, also says that it was not earlier than Marathon. Anaximenes the rhetorician, however, attributed its origin to Solon; Plut. Public. 9. Demosth. Lept. p. 499 (§ 156), says that the Athenians are singular in their custom of public funerals, and funeral orations. Besides the oration of Pericles in Thucydides, the Menexenus of Plato, the ἐπιτάφιος λόγος of Lysias, and that attributed to Demosthenes, afford examples of this class of compositions.

The curious passage of Gorgias in Max. Planudes Schol. ad Hermog. vol. v. p. 548, ed. Walz, appears to be taken from a funeral oration. See Clinton, F. H. vol. ii. p. 378, n. Gorgias was nearly contemporary with Pericles. It refers to Athenians who had distinguished themselves in war. It was probably composed for delivery by some Athenian citizen, or perhaps merely as a rhetorical exercise.

Compare the characteristic of λόγοι ἐπιτάφιοι in Menander de Epidict. c. 11. in Walz, Rhet. Græc. vol. ix. p. 287, who cites the three Epitaphian orations of Aristides (see Orat. xi and xii. vol. i. p. 126, 134, ed. Dindorf.). See also Himerius, πολεμαρχικός. The choice of the orator is stated by Menander, ib. to have been made by the Archon Polemarchus. On funeral orations, as a source of Roman history, see Egger. Examen des Historiens anciens d'Auguste, p. 90.

Polybius (who gives a detailed account of the custom, as still subsisting), an admiration of great deeds is instilled into the minds of the hearers, and a spirit of emulation is aroused among the young; while the fame of illustrious men is renovated and immortalized, and the reputation of the benefactors of their country is not only diffused among contemporaries, but is handed down to succeeding generations.(12)

Dionysius remarks that the Roman had this advantage over the Athenian practice; that whereas the latter was limited to the praise of men who had died for their country in war, the former included all sorts of civic virtues, and comprehended those of a statesman as well as of a warrior.(13)

Polybius speaks of the funeral panegyrics as an established custom of the Roman state, which had been one of the incentives to the patriotic devotion and courage so characteristic of the Romans.(14) The origin of it is referred to P. Valerius Publicola, who is said to have pronounced the first funeral oration over his colleague Brutus, slain in a combat with Aruns Tarquinius, in the year after the expulsion of the kings.(15) Dionysius, however, speaks of it as an ancient practice, and doubts whether it was not derived from the regal period. Its origin may be safely referred to an early time; but the story which connects its origin with the celebrated names of Valerius and Brutus, must be considered as legendary.

Even Roman matrons were, on proper occasions, permitted to receive a public eulogy, pronounced at their funeral. This privilege was, according to Livy, accorded to the matrons as a reward for their patriotism in contributing their golden ornaments in order to make up the sum required for ransoming the city from the Gauls.(16) According to Dionysius, the contribution which received this recompense, was made towards a golden crater, vowed by the city as an offering to Delphi, after the taking of Veii.(17) From this variation in the accounts, we may infer that, although the custom was real, the explanatory story was a fiction.

---

(12) *ἐξ ὧν καινοποιουμένης ἀεὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς ἐπ' ἀρετῇ φήμης ἀθανατίζεται μὲν ἡ τῶν καλῶν τι διαπραξαμένων εὔκλεια, γνώριμος δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ παραδόσιμος τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις ἡ τῶν εὐεργετησάντων τὴν πατρίδα γίγνεται δόξα*, vi. 54.

(13) V. 17. Compare Cicero de Leg. ii. 24, who prescribes the following law: 'Honoratiorum virorum laudes in concione memorantor, easque etiam cantus ad tibicinem prosequitor.'

(14) See ib. c. 52, 3.

(15) Dion. Hal. v. 17; Plut. Public. 9. Livy merely says that Valerius performed the funeral obsequies of his colleague with as much pomp as the circumstances of the time permitted, but that he was chiefly honoured by the mourning of the nations. His narrative seems inconsistent with the supposition that he had met with the story of the funeral oration over Brutus.

Polybius further describes the manner in which the memory of the distinguished members of a family was honoured and cherished, by preserving their portraits in the most conspicuous part of the house, carefully executed, and illustrated with proper inscriptions. These portraits were painted waxen masks, ordinarily enclosed in wooden cases, but on the occasion of funerals of other members of the same family, they were worn by persons who represented the deceased ancestors, and were decorated with all the ornaments and insignia of the proper offices; these persons sat in curule chairs round the rostra, when the funeral oration was delivered.(18) The waxen figures of the

---

(16) Livy, v. 50. Matronis gratiæ actæ honosque additus, ut earum, sicut virorum, post mortem solemnis laudatio esset. A compensation is stated to have been subsequently made; vi. 4.

(17) Plut. Camill. 8; Diod. xiv. 116. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. n. 1065, treats Livy's origin as true. See below, ch. xii, § 74.

(18) vi. 53. See Juv. viii. 1—20. After the death of Julius Cæsar, a decree was made that his image should not be carried at the funeral of any of his family, which very ancient custom, says Dio, was still observed. The ground of this regulation was that Cæsar had then become a god. Dio Cass. xlvii. 19.

The account of Pliny is similar: he states that in his time the painting of (waxen) images, such as had formerly been practised, was succeeded by busts and statues of more costly materials: 'Imaginum quidem picturâ quam maxime similes in ævum propagabantur figuræ; quod in totum exolevit.' He afterwards adds: 'Aliter apud majores in atriis hæc erant quæ spectarentur, non signa externorum artificum, nec æra, aut marmora; expressi cerâ vultus singulis disponebantur armariis, ut essent imagines, quæ comitarentur gentilitia funera; semperque defuncto aliquo, totus aderat familiæ ejus, qui unquam fuerat, populus. Stemmata vero lineis discurrebant ad imagines pictas.' H. N. xxxv. 2.

The striking resemblance of these figures is mentioned both by Polydistinguished members of a noble family were indeed used as a sort of illustrated pedigree; and they served as credentials, as well as reminiscences, of the high descent of a person of ancient race; at the same time they helped to keep up the memory of the great deeds of the olden time, and to preserve unbroken the thread which connects the present with the past.(19) Valerius Maximus particularly mentions that the figures of ancestors, together with the inscriptions recording their exploits, were

---

bius and Pliny: which would be the case with painted wax heads—however little merit they might have as works of art.

According to Pliny, xxxv. 3, the first Appius Claudius dedicated, in the temple of Bellona, a set of shields on which portraits of his ancestors were represented. These ancestors, however, must have been Sabines, not Romans; and the notice cannot be relied upon as historical. Other ancestorial shields are stated by Pliny to have been set up by M. Æmilius, who was consul in 78 B.C. Ib. c. 4.

(19) See Becker, vol. ii. 1, p. 220—2; and Müller, Arch. der Kunst, p. 166, 7, who remarks that the wax figures of ancestors in the atrium are rather to be considered as masks for processions than as statues. Also Arnold, Hist. of Rome, vol. ii. p. 456.

The description of the vestibule of the palace of Picus, in the Æneid, may be considered as an embellished and amplified adaptation of the atrium of a Roman house.

> Quinetiam veterum effigies ex ordine avorum
> Antiquâ e cedro, Italusque, paterque Sabinus
> Vitisator, curvam servans sub imagine falcem,
> Saturnusque senex, Janique bifrontis imago,
> Vestibulo adstabant, aliique ab origine reges,
> Martiaque ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi.
> Multaque præterea sacris in postibus arma,
> Captivi pendent currus, curvæque secures,
> Et cristæ capitum, et portarum ingentia claustra,
> Spiculaque, clypeique, ereptaque rostra carinis.
> vii. 177—86.

If a Roman family possessed any trophies, or other ancient relics, they were doubtless preserved among the ancestorial images; the whole thus forming a gallery of antiquities. That it was the custom to preserve spoils taken in war, fixed up in houses, appears from Livy's description of the classes of persons whom Fabius added to the Senate, in order to fill up the void created by the losses in the early part of the Second Punic War. The last class consists 'ex iis qui magistratus non cepissent, *qui spolia ex hoste fixa domi haberent*, aut civicam coronam accepissent.' xxiii. 23. See also the allusions in x. 7; xxxviii. 43.

Pliny likewise describes military trophies, and records of victories, as the accompaniments of the portraits of ancestors around the atrium: 'Aliæ foris et circa limina domitarum gentium imagines erant affixis hostium spoliis, quæ nec emptori refigere liceret: triumphabantque etiam dominis mutatis ipsæ domus; et erat hæc stimulatio ingens, exprobrantibus tectis, quotidie imbellem dominum intrare in alienum triumphum.' N. H. xxxv. 2.

placed in the hall of the house, in order that their posterity might not only read, but imitate their virtues.(20)

Such was the custom of the Romans with respect to funeral orations, and waxen figures, as commemorative of illustrious men. The origin of funeral orations is referred to the commencement of the commonwealth; but the earliest composition of this sort which is known to have been committed to writing, and published, is the oration of Fabius Maximus on his son, which was subsequent to the year 213 B.C. If therefore this was the first funeral oration which was preserved to posterity, those who began to construct a historical narrative of the first five centuries of the city in the time of the Second Punic War could not have derived any information from this source.

The origin of public funerals in Roman history is attributed to the two patriotic consuls, Brutus and Publicola. When Brutus had been slain by the young Tarquin during his consulship, his funeral is stated to have been solemnized by his colleague; and the matrons wore mourning for him during a whole year, as for a parent; because he had been the avenger of female modesty.(21)

We are further told that Valerius Publicola, having died poor, was honoured with a sumptuous funeral at the public expense, and that the matrons mourned for him a year, as they had mourned for Brutus.(22) Niebuhr conjectures that these particulars respecting the funeral of Publicola were derived from the funeral orations of his family;(23) but probably no such oration was reduced to writing at this early time; and the account is doubtless legendary, not less than the story which traces the privilege of the Valerian family to bury their dead on the Velia, to a vote of the citizens on the same occasion.(24)

---

(20) Effigies majorum cum titulis suis idcirco in primâ ædium parte poni solere, ut eorum virtutes posteri non solum legerent, sed etiam imitarentur; v. 8, 3. Plutarch, Cimon. 2, and Tacitus, in the celebrated passage at the end of the Agricola, in preferring biography to busts and portraits, as preserving the memory of the departed great, at the same time admit the resemblance of their functions in this respect.

(21) Collegæ funus quanto tum potuit apparatu, fecit. Sed multo majus morti decus publica fuit mæstitia, eo ante omnia insignis, quia matronæ annum, ut parentem, eum luxerunt, quod tam acer ultor violatæ pudicitiæ fuisset. Livy, ii. 7. The same statement is given briefly by Script. de Vir. Ill. c. 10. Compare Dion. Hal. v. 17, who does not mention the mourning of the matrons in this place, but afterwards in c. 48, he says that the matrons lamented Publicola, as they had lamented Brutus, by not wearing gold and purple ornaments for a year.

(22) See Livy, ii. 16; Dion. v. 48; Plut. Public. 23; Script. de Vir. Ill. c. 15.

Niebuhr indeed is of opinion that the funeral orations were committed to writing at an early period, and that many stories in the history prior to the Gallic conflagration, were derived from this source.(25) He does not indeed estimate them highly, either as accurate records of facts, or as eloquent compositions;(26) but it is difficult to find any trace of their existence at these early dates; and no positive evidence has been adduced which affords any support to his hypothesis.

---

(23) Hist. vol. i. p. 559.

(24) Plut. ib. Plutarch mentions that the people contributed a quadrans each towards the funeral of Publicola. Livy states that, in the year 493 B.C., Menenius Agrippa received a public funeral, and that the plebs contributed a sextans apiece. 'Extulit eum plebs sextantibus collatis in capita.'—ii. 33. The account in Script. de Vir. Illust. c. 18, mentions a contribution of a quadrans, in 460 B.C. P. Valerius the consul, having been killed in recovering the Capitol from the surprise of Herdonius, the plebs brought their contributions of a quadrans apiece to his house, in order that he might obtain a more honourable funeral. 'In consulis domum plebs quadrantes, ut funere ampliore efferretur, jactasse fertur.'—iii. 18. P. Decius the younger received splendid obsequies, and a funeral oration was pronounced over him by his colleague Fabius: Livy, x. 29; Script. de Vir. Illust. 27. A large subscription was made by the people for the funeral of Q. Fabius Rullianus. De Vir. Ill. 32. Concerning public funerals, see Becker, ii. 2, p. 350. n. 879. The ediles made sumptuary laws for restraining the expense of funerals, and for preventing unnecessary pomp in their celebration.—ib. p. 318.

(25) 'Only in course of time, when it became customary to enumerate the ancestors of a house up to its origin, along with their honours and their exploits, could vanity indulge in inventions concerning them. *One may easily satisfy oneself* that, in the history prior to the taking by the Gauls, many stories, for instance about the Valerii, the Claudii, the Fabii, the Quinctii, and the Servilii, have flowed from this source [viz. funeral orations]. Several among them, such as those concerning the Servilii, are *worthy of full faith:* those, too, more in detail about the Fabii contain matter of *undeniable authenticity.* With others, the case is very different. *I am sorry to say that those of the Valerii are less deserving of credit than any others;* just as their pedigree betrays singular carelessness. These documents, as well as the former, were deposited in the hall of the house; and they were probably lost, and then restored together.'—Hist. vol. ii. p.5. Compare Lect. vol. 1, p. xii. xiii. He supposes the 'annalists' to have known of panegyrical speeches of the Fabii about 480 B.C. Hist. vol. ii. p. 198; Lect. vol. i. p. 162. A conjecture respecting the funeral oration of Q. Fabius Rullianus, is proposed in Mr. Macaulay's Lays, p. 29.

(26) Ib. p. 4.

The short biographical notices which were inscribed under the ancestorial images were doubtless in many cases derived from an early date. Many such inscriptions, ascending to the time of the capture of the city, and perhaps even to an earlier period, may have been in existence at the beginning of the Second Punic War. An extant inscription upon Appius the Blind, which though not contemporary is of considerable antiquity, will probably give a correct idea of the contents of one of these notices.

'Appius Claudius Cæcus, the son of Caius, was censor, twice consul, dictator, three times interrex, twice prætor, twice curule ædile, questor, three times military tribune; he took several towns from the Samnites; he routed an army of the Sabines and Tuscans; he prevented peace from being made with king Pyrrhus. During his censorship he laid down the Appian road, and brought water into the city: he also built the temple of Bellona.'(27)

The monumental inscription upon Scipio Barbatus, which is as early as about 283 B.C., is probably of a very similar character to those which were placed under the waxen images in the hall of the family mansion.

'Cornelius Lucius Scipio Barbatus, the son of Cnæus, a brave and wise man; whose beauty was equal to his valour. He was consul, censor, and edile among you. He took Taurasia and Cisauna in Samnium. He subdued all Lucania, and carried away the hostages.'(28)

---

(27) 'Appius Claudius C. F. Cæcus censor, consul bis, dictator, interrex ter, prætor bis, ædilis curulis bis, quæstor, tribunus militum ter, complura oppida de Samnitibus cepit, Sabinorum et Tuscorum exercitum fudit, pacem fieri cum Pyrrho rege prohibuit. In censurâ viam Appiam stravit, et aquam in urbem adduxit: ædem Bellonæ fecit.'—Ap. Orell. Inscript. Lat. vol. i. p. 146, n. 539. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 369. Klotz, ib. p. 319; Egger, Lat. Serm. Rel. p. 101.

(28) Cornelius Lucius Scipio Barbatus, Gnaivod patre prognatus, fortis vir sapiensque, quojus forma virtutei parisuma fuit. Consul, censor, aidilis

The authors of funeral panegyrics, and of epitaphs and monumental inscriptions, have in no age or country considered themselves as impartial historians, and as unbiassed biographers. Though they may tell the truth, they do not tell the whole truth. The facts which they mention may be authentic, but they suppress what is unfavourable. If a Roman supplied the higher links in a pedigree, or added inscriptions for ancestors who had lived some generations back, there was doubtless far less regard to historical truth than in the inscription for a person recently deceased.

Cicero, however, in speaking of the funeral panegyrics, which were extant in his time, and which were subsequent to Appius the Blind, describes them as composed with little regard to accuracy. 'The families (he says) preserved them both as ornaments and memorials: both for purposes of reference, whenever any member of the same family died, and also in order to commemorate their own praises, and to render their own nobility more illustrious. By these panegyrics, however, the veraciousness of our history has been somewhat diminished—for many things have been stated in them which are not true: triumphs which never occurred, more consulships than were really held, even false descents, and transitions from the plebs, by which persons of humble birth were removed into another family of the same gentile name: as if I were to say that I was descended from Manius Tullius, a patrician, who was consul with Servius Sulpicius in the tenth year after the expulsion of the kings.'(29)

Livy informs us that there was a discrepancy of testimonies as to the commanders in the Samnite campaign of 322 B.C. and the consequent triumph: some authorities named A. Cornelius

---

quei fuit apud vos. Taurasia, Cisauna, Samnio cepit. Subigit omne Loucana opsidesque abdoucit. Orelli Inscript. Lat. vol. i. p. 149. Comparo Egger, ib. p. 100; Klotz. ib. p. 311. Donaldson's Varronianus, p. 222. ed. 2. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 364—378. I have followed Niebuhr in considering *Samnio* as the ablative case. See Corssen Orig. Poes. Rom. p. 104. Niebuhr approves of a conjecture that the work *De Viris Illustribus* was derived from a collection of inscriptions on statues. Hist. vol. iii. note 122; but it is rejected on sufficient grounds by Becker, vol. i. p. 56.

(29) Brut. c. 16. The year referred to is 500 B.C.

Cossus Arvina, the dictator, others the consuls, L. Fulvius Curvus, and Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus. It seems that Cornelius Arvina was certainly dictator; but the authorities differed as to whether he commanded against the Samnites, or was appointed dictator merely for the formal purpose of giving the signal for the chariots in the Roman games. Livy avows himself unable, in this conflict of testimonies, to decide in favour of either version of the story. He declares his belief that the truth has been distorted by funeral panegyrics, and mendacious inscriptions on the images of ancestors; each family falsely attributing to itself the fame of great exploits and public honours. 'Hence (he adds) both the deeds of individuals, and the public records of history, have been thrown into confusion; nor is there any writer contemporary with those times, whose authority could be safely relied on.'(30)

Livy, again, in a later period of his history, recurs to this source of inaccuracy. He says that most of the historians described Fabius Maximus as having been appointed dictator in the second year of the Punic war (217 B.C.); whereas the consul who had the right of naming the dictator was then in his province of Cisalpine Gaul, and as the circumstances were urgent, and the consul's return could not be waited for, Fabius was appointed pro dictator instead of dictator: but his success in the war, the great reputation of the general, and the exaggerations of posterity in composing the inscription for his image, caused him to be called dictator instead of pro-dictator.(31)

In the last instance, the error was not considerable. Substantially, Fabius was dictator; though, from formal difficulties respecting his election, he was appointed only pro-dictator. Polybius, who would never be guilty of any substantial perversion of the truth, describes him as having been appointed dictator.(32) When however the time was more remote, and the events less well known, it is highly probable that the notices appended to the images of ancestors were occasionally decorated with unreal honours and exploits. Family pride might produce the same effects with respect to the individual, as patriotism with respect to the state.(33) At the same time, it is difficult to understand how a funeral panegyric, which was delivered in public immediately after a man's death, could have contained such falsifications of fact, as those described by Cicero. The most partial kinsman could not have ventured, in an audience of well-informed contemporaries, to depart from notorious facts; and if we suppose that the funeral orations were published as they were delivered, we cannot understand how their statements of fact could have deviated very widely from the truth; though their estimate of a man's character and importance might have been unduly favourable. Thus Cæsar might, with impunity, describe his aunt Julia as descended from Ancus Marcius and Venus, but he could not have taken equal liberties with fact in the events of her life.(34)

---

(30) viii. 39, 40. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 200, who inclines to think that the consuls conducted the war: but it is impossible for us to decide a question which Livy, with the evidence, such as it was, of the earliest writers on the subject before him, could not resolve. A similar view is taken by Wachsmuth, Aelt. Gesch. p. 15. A falsus imaginis titulus is mentioned by Livy, iv. 16.

(31) Res inde gestas, gloriamque insignem ducis, *et augentes titulum imaginis posteros*, ut dictator Prodictatore diceretur facile obtinuisse.—xxii. 31. The circumstances under which Fabius was appointed pro-dictator instead of dictator, are explained in detail above in c. 8. Compare Becker, ii. 2, p. 157.

§ 3 It is not improbable that the composition of family memorials may have been carried one step beyond the funeral panegyrics and the inscriptions of images, and that the exploits of a series of distinguished persons, belonging to the same lineage, may have been combined into a connected narrative for the use of certain illustrious houses. That such memoirs of historical families were sometimes composed in later times is certain. Gellius describes himself as having read a memoir of this kind relating to the Porcian family.(35) Atticus likewise devoted a particular attention to the history of the great Roman families.(36) Messala also wrote a work on the same subject.(37)

---

(32) See iii. 87. He takes occasion, in connexion with this appointment, to explain to his Greek readers the difference between the offices of dictator and consul. Compare Appian, Rom. Hist. vii. 12.

(33) Thus Pliny, xxxv. 2, says, Sed pace Messalarum dixisse liceat, etiam mentiri clarorum imagines erat aliquis virtutum amor.

The subject of the family records, and of the motives for their falsification, is well treated by Wachsmuth, Aeltere Gesch. des Röm. Staats. p. 12—15.

(34) Suet. Cæsar. 6. Niebuhr. Hist. vol. ii. note 7, remarks that the account of the Claudii in Suetonius, at the beginning of his Tiberius, was derived from the funeral orations of that house, and exemplifies the nature of such enumerations.

Niebuhr admits that there were no family narratives which reached as far back as the time of the kings; but he thinks that 'from the very beginning of the commonwealth the family histories related much of its great men; though what they related may not always be worthy of credit.'(38) The Roman history may, in the early ages of the commonwealth, have the appearance of having been composed from the memoirs of the great families, and, in the absence of any other known origin for the received narrative, we may be tempted to suppose the existence of such compositions, in order to obtain a solution of our problem. There is, however, no historical trace of the existence of private memoirs of great families at an early date; nor are we justified by any positive evidence in assuming that the original framers of the history of the first four and a-half centuries were assisted by any such compositions. Niebuhr, indeed, conjectures that the account of the antipopular demeanour of Appius Claudius in the year 495 B.C., 'probably came from the family commentaries of the Claudii, who, priding themsleves on their hatred of the people, as the Valerii did on their hereditary love of the people, portrayed their ancestor with the characteristic features of their house.'(39) But this is a mere hypothesis, of which no proof can be given; and Niebuhr does not represent the supposed memoirs as a contemporary or even an ancient record; for he adds, that no historical account of this Claudius had been preserved.

---

(35) xiii. 39.

(36) Nepos, Att. c. 18. Atticus also wrote a work on portraits (De Imaginibus), and Varro inserted 700 portraits of illustrious men in his works. Plin. N. H. xxxv. 2.

(37) Plin. ib.

(38) Hist. vol. i. p. 253-4.

(39) Hist. vol. i. p. 599. Compare the speech of Sempronius in Livy, ix. 14; and Drumann, Geschichte Roms, vol. ii. p. 160.

There is more apparent ground for his conjecture that the events of the twelve years from 485 to 477 B.C., beginning with the first of the seven successive consulships of the Fabii, and ending with the battle of Cremera,(40) as well as the detailed accounts of Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, in the tenth book of Livy,(41) were derived from a history of the Fabian family. But

---

(40) 'When we read in Livy and Dionysius the account of the seven consulships of the Fabii, the battle of the Veientines, the history of Q. Fabius Maximus (in the last book of Livy's first decad), we have no other alternative but believing that we have before us either an extremely well-contrived fiction, or an historical narrative founded upon ancient documents belonging to the house of the Fabii.' Lect. vol. 1, p. xx. Concerning this brilliant period of the Fabian house, see Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 175—206.

Compare the summing-up of Livy, ii. 42. Fabium inde nomen ingens post tres continuos consulatus, unoque velut tenore omnes expertos tribuniciis certaminibus, habitum: *Itaque ut bene locatus mansit in eâ familiâ aliquamdiu honos* (483 B.C.): and see the expressions respecting the great merits of the Fabian family, in c. 49.

(41) In Hist. vol. ii. p. 8, Niebuhr says, that considering the eminence of the Fabian family for their skill in the arts, and their acquaintance with Greek literature, they would be likely to keep a family chronicle, and that the account of the campaign of Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, in 451 B.C. is evidently taken from contemporary sources. In his Lectures he says: 'In the last books of Livy's first decad, we have such *accurate* accounts of the campaigns against the Samnites, that I have no doubt but that either Q. Fabius Maximus himself wrote for his house the history of the wars in which he was engaged, because his house was of great historical importance; or that the Fabii possessed numerous documents relating to their early history.' Afterwards he adds: 'The Fabii seem to me to have been a learned family, and I believe that they had their chronicles long before one of their number wrote a history in Greek.' Vol. i. p. xx. In another place he attributes the minuteness in the accounts of the campaigns of Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus to the existence of family records; and he thinks that not a few statements in them can be pointed out, which are owing to family vanity. Ib. p. 12.

The following is another hypothesis on the same subject: 'The account of this campaign [in 480 B.C.] looks very much as if it had been taken from the domestic memoirs of the Fabian house; nay, the statement that Marcus Fabius delivered the funeral oration over Quintus and over his colleague, hardly leaves room to doubt that *the annalists* knew of a panegyrical speech ascribed to him.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 198.

The words of Livy are: 'Funera deinde duo deinceps, collegæ fratrisque, ducit: idem in utroque laudator:' ii. 47. There is nothing to show that the funeral orations of Marcus Fabius over his brother Quintus although these portions of the Roman history naturally suggest a recourse to this supposition, we are not justified in assuming the existence of such a family chronicle, without further evidence than can now be obtained.

Hooke, in his Dissertation on the Credibility of the History of the first Five Hundred Years of Rome, gives the following account of the manner in which the earliest writers of Roman history derived their information from family memorials and funeral orations.

'Fabius Pictor and his nearest followers adopted traditional stories which pleased the national vanity, and of which those historians had no desire to destroy the belief, even when they could have done it by the means of authentic monuments, and in many instances they were destitute of those means. The circumstantial accounts of the exploits of particular men, I conjecture to have been taken from family memorials and funeral orations; because I cannot conceive from what other source the historians could have them. For the Great Annals, according to the description of them by Cicero, must have been too brief to descend often to circumstances of actions; and tradition (as M. de Pouilly observes) never informs us of circumstances any more than of dates. When fiction or uncertainty is apparent in the accounts given us of the heroic deeds of this or that great man, I apprehend that those accounts were taken from family memorials and funeral orations, of low date, when, the power of the Romans growing considerable, and their vanity keeping pace with it, genealogies became a matter of great moment to private families . . . . . Family memorials and funeral orations, composed in the earliest times of the Republic, would be excellent

---

and his colleague Cn. Manlius were committed to writing, and preserved to posterity, and consequently were accessible to the later *annalists:* that is, to the historians after Fabius Pictor, who were divided by about 300 years from this time. Compare Lect. vol i. p. 162, where he again speaks of the accounts of this campaign being derived from funeral laudations of the Fabian gens.

Niebuhr remarks that Gellius, xvii. 21, § 13, had the 'express authority of ancient books' for saying that the 306 Fabii perished with their families on the Cremera: Hist. vol. ii. p. 193. But these 'ancient books' appear to be the imaginary 'Annals,' of which he speaks elsewhere; and are not intended to be family memoirs.

materials for an historian; and even those of later date, where truth was mingled with fiction, would be good authority with regard not only to contemporary facts, but to facts much earlier than those pieces, if many of those pieces agreed in the same account.'(42)

Elsewhere, he makes these additional remarks on the same subject:—'Though much the greater number of these funeral orations were unquestionably lost, when Fabius, about 300 years after the expulsion of Tarquin, undertook a general history of Rome; yet that many of them were preserved, and especially of those posterior to the rebuilding of the city, there seems no reason to doubt. What could Livy mean by the *privata monumenta*, of which, he says, the greater part was destroyed by the Gauls,(43) but these funeral orations and other family memorials? For he speaks of them as pieces that would have been useful towards a general and clear history of those times.'(44)

In these comments, Hooke argues that the circumstantial accounts of the exploits of particular men, in the received history of the early ages of Rome, must have been derived from family memorials and funeral orations, because they could not have been taken from any other source. But this *reductio ad absurdum* is inconclusive; because it is conceivable that the details in question may have been altogether fictitious; nor even if we suppose them to have been borrowed from family memorials, should we much assist our argument, unless we also knew the time when these memorials were drawn up, and the authority on which they were founded.

Neither is the other argument of Hooke, that the *privata monumenta*, described by Livy as having for the most part perished in the Gallic conflagration, were funeral orations and other family memorials, much more conclusive. For they might have been the *imaginum tituli*, the inscriptions under the waxen figures of ancestors, if this custom had been then introduced. But whatever the *privata monumenta* meant by Livy may have been, the question is not of great practical importance, as few of them survived the disaster, and were preserved as materials for history.

---

(42) Dissertation on the Credibility of the History of the first Five Hundred Years of Rome. (Hist. vol. iv. 8vo.) p. xxxix. xl.

(43) See above, p. 152, note 71.

(44) Dissertation, p. xxxv.

Beaufort is of opinion that the chief source from which the early Roman historians drew their accounts of the first five centuries, was the memoirs of the great families.(45) According to Niebuhr, popular poems, combined with funeral panegyrics, were the material out of which the original narrative of early Roman history was formed.(46) Dr. Arnold likewise speaks of the oldest Roman annalists compiling their narratives out of family traditions and funeral orations.(47) But these suppositions rest on no satisfactory basis; they are merely imagined as explanations of facts which admit of other solutions; and there is no positive evidence to show that the history of the early ages of Rome was to any great extent derived from funeral panegyrics or the memoirs of the great families; though particular facts respecting the honours of certain persons may have been taken from inscriptions and records in private archives or collections; such as those alluded to by Cicero and Livy.

Niebuhr indeed goes still further, and supposes the existence of brief historical works, of some meagre annals written by private hands, before the time of Fabius and Cincius. One such chronicle, by an unknown author, he supposes to have contained an account of the Second Samnite War, and to have been accessible to Livy.(48)

---

(45) Dissertation, p. 96.

(46) 'After the first scanty records of the early times had for the most part been destroyed in the Gallic conflagration, they were restored according to certain schemes from the songs of the *Vates;* the poems became altered as they passed from mouth to mouth, and they, combined with the *laudationes*, form the groundwork of our history,—the material which Fabius found when he began to write.' Lect. vol. i. p. 12.

(47) He speaks of 'the family traditions and funeral orations out of which the oldest annalists compiled their narratives;' vol. i. p. 371: and he says 'the beautiful and romantic story of the fall of Veii belongs entirely to the traditions and funeral orations of the Furian family; ib. p. 391. With respect to the alleged defeat of the Gauls by Camillus, he says: 'Such a falsification, scarcely to be paralleled in the annals of any other people, justifies the strongest suspicion of all those accounts of victories and triumphs which appear to rest in any degree on the authority of the family memorials of the Roman aristocracy;' ib. p. 548. He thinks that the account of the First Samnite War is taken from the funeral orations and traditional stories of the Valerian family; vol. ii. p. 113. See also, ib. p. 180, 200, 452.

From the preservation of the speech of Appius the Blind in writing, Niebuhr likewise infers the contemporaneous existence of historical composition.(49) He even goes so far as to suppose that chronicles were drawn up by private hands, from personal experience for contemporary events, and from popular tradition and funeral orations for the preceding time,—and that these writings became popular, and were widely diffused in the fifth and sixth centuries of the city: that is to say, from 353 to 153 B.C.(50)

Nothing can be more positive and precise than the assurance of Dionysius that there were no native Roman historians before Fabius and Cincius who wrote in the Second Punic War.(51) Livy moreover treats Fabius as the most ancient writer; and if such distinct testimonies are to be set aside on mere conjecture, all possibility of arriving at any certainty respecting Roman history, considering the scantiness of our information, is at an end. Nor is the testimony of Dionysius and Livy unsupported: for Cicero, in going through the prose compositions of a historical nature prior to his own time, stops at Fabius and Cato, and clearly intimates that no such works of an earlier date were known to him; though he mentions the speech of Appius the Blind and the early funeral panegyrics.(52) Not only therefore is the supposition of historical works anterior to Fabius unsupported by any evidence, but it is directly opposed to the clearest testimonies of the most credible witnesses. Besides, the penury of writing materials, and the absence of all literary habits among the Romans before the Second Punic War, forbid the idea that there could have been at that time any popular books, historical or otherwise, in general circulation. Even under the empire, the number of copies of a book was probably very inconsiderable. It may be doubted whether there ever were a hundred copies of Virgil or Horace in existence at any one time before the invention of printing.

---

(48) 'There existed some nameless chronicles as early as that time, though they may have been dry and obscure in their details: *the fact that isochronistic history does not commence till a hundred years later is here of no consequence.* Livy has unfortunately made no use at all of the ancient materials which formed the foundation of the Annales.' Lect., vol. i. p. 351. The Second Samnite War lasted from 326 to 304 B.C.

(49) 'We may be sure that at a time when such speeches were written and preserved, historical composition was not neglected.' Lect. vol. 1, p. xxii.

(50) 'Long before there is any such thing as a national literature, many a man will write down an account of what has befallen him, for the use of his family. In the progress of things almost every one will aim at surpassing his predecessors, will go more into detail, take in more objects, and make approaches to a complete narrative of contemporary events: and as every chronicle must begin from the beginning, a new one subjoining itself as a continuation to a repetition of some older annals already extant, attempts are made to render these less meagre, by incorporating popular traditions. At Rome, the funeral orations likewise were drawn upon; though there was a difficulty in making such insertions, owing to the form of the Annals, which required that everything should be set down under a particular year. *In this way a variety of popular books must have grown up*, which, before a different taste and standard became prevalent, *were great favourites*, and which in the fifth and sixth centuries of the city *must have spread the more widely*, in proportion as the old legends lost the freshness of their original colouring: in aftertimes however they were neglected by literary history, for this among other reasons, that their authors were unknown.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 7.

(51) Above, p. 37, 78.

Judging from the example of modern times, we should infer that the composition of national annals, in a continuous form, would precede the composition of any family history.(53) Whenever the literary cultivation of any people has reached the point at which a consecutive historical narrative is formed, the fortunes of the entire nation, as being the most notorious, and the subject of the strongest and most general interest, are likely to command the attention of writers before the fortunes of any single family, however powerful, wealthy, or illustrious.

§ 4 It has been conjectured that the Romans, in framing the history of their early centuries, may have been assisted by the chronicles of neighbouring states:(54) but there are few positive traces of the existence of any such writings. We have already seen that, in describing their early relations with the Greeks, as with Alexander the Molossian, Cleonymus, and Pyrrhus, the Romans may have been assisted by Greek accounts. The affairs of Sicily likewise were related, from an early time, by Greek historians; and no separate history of the First Punic War was, as it appears, written before that of Philinus of Agrigentum. The Greeks in early times knew but little of the Romans, who spoke a barbarian, or non-Hellenic, language; and would only mention them when they began to be mixed up with the events of Greek history.

---

(52) See Brut. 16; De Orat. ii. 12; De Leg. i. 2.

(53) For a list of genealogical histories, see Dufresnoy. Méthode pour étudier l'Histoire, tom. iv. p. 314—353. They are not in general very ancient.

(54) Voss. de Hist. Lat. i. c. i., supposes the early Roman history to have been taken from annals of the Sabines, Etruscans, and Tarentines.

The curious detailed account of Aristodemus Malacus, the despot of Cumæ, which is given by Dionysius, is probably derived from some native Cuman history; but its early date, the absence of any known author who lived at or near the time, and its disagreement with other accounts of the same person, render its veracity suspicious.(55)

An anonymous history of Cumæ is cited by Festus, in explanation of the derivation of the Greek name Ῥώμη from an earlier Latin appellation, *Valentia;* but this circumstance makes it probable that the work was some recent compilation of mythical stories, composed in the Latin language, and therefore of no importance as a historical authority.(56) A similar collection of legendary tales with respect to Præneste, likewise existed; from which Solinus quotes the account of the finding of Cæculus near the fire, the mythical founder of Præneste,(57) alluded to by Virgil. Some fabulous accounts of the derivation of the Sabines from Lacedæmon are cited by Dionysius from their native histories.(58)

---

(55) Dion. Hal. vii. 3—11.

(56) Festus in Romam, p. 266, where the writer of the work is called 'Historiæ Cumanæ compositor.' Concerning the name *Valentia* for Rome, see the passages cited by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 595. A statement of Dion. Hal. vii. 3. as to an attack of Etruscans and other nations upon Cumæ, in the time of Tarquinius Superbus, is supposed by Müller, Etr. vol. i. p. 153. to have been derived from Cuman chronicles.

Niebuhr conjectures that the account of the manner in which Naples fell into the hands of the Romans, in Livy, viii. 226, was borrowed from Dionysius, and that Dionysius derived it from a Neapolitan chronicle; Lect. vol. 1, p. lvii.

(57) 'Præneste, ut Zenodotus, a Præneste Ulyxis nepote Latini filio: ut Prænestini sonant libri, a Cæculo, quem juxta ignes fortuitos invenerunt,

So far as the Etruscans had any literature, it was anterior to that of Rome. The earliest rude form of scenic amusements, represented at Rome, is stated by Livy to have been introduced from Etruria in the year 364 B.C., about thirty years after the rebuilding of the city; but they are described as consisting merely of dancing and gestures, to the sound of the pipe, without any verse or recitation.(59) It does not appear that the Etruscans

---

ut fama est, Digitorum sorores;' Solinus, c. 2, § 9. Compare Servius ad Æn. vii. 678; and Interp. Mai. ad v. 681. The *Digiti* of Solinus are *Depidii* in the Scholiast of Mai, and *divi* in Servius. Bormann, Alt-Lat. Chor. p. 215, reads *Digiti* in Servius, and *Digitii* in the Scholiast of Mai.

(58) *ἐν ἱστορίαις ἐπιχωρίοις λεγόμενος λόγος*, ii. 14. Dio Cassius likewise says of Numa, *φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ τὰ σαφέστατα Σαβίνων εἰδότες ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ᾗ ἡ Ῥώμη ἐκτίσθη γεγεννῆσθαι*, Fragm. vi. 5. ed. Bekker, Compare Plut. Rom. 3. The expression of Dio seems to be imitated from Thuc. i. 9. *λέγουσι δὲ οἱ τὰ σαφέστατα Πελοποννησίων μνήμῃ παρὰ τῶν πρότερον δεδεγμένοι.*

(59) 'Sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu, ludiones ex Etruriâ acciti, ad tibicinis modos saltantes haud indecoros motus, more Tusco, dabant;' Livy, vii. 2. Afterwards he adds: 'Quia hister Tusco verbo ludio vocabatur, nomen histrionibus inditum.' Compare Val. Max. ii. 4, § 4. Plutarch, Quæst. Rom. 107, says that the word was derived from Istrus, the name of the principal player, who came to Rome at this time. According to Festus, in the excerpt of Paulus Diaconus (p. 101, ed. Müller), the word *Histrio*, was derived from *Histria*, the country from which actors are supposed to have been introduced into Rome. 'Histriones dicti quod primum ex Histriâ venerint.' It seems therefore doubtful whether the Tuscan origin of the word was well-established: though the derivation of Festus is probably an unauthorized guess, founded merely on similarity of sound; like the derivation of Britain from Brutus.

Ovid, in describing the festival distinguished by the rape of the Sabines, supposes it to be celebrated only with music and dancing by Tuscan performers:

> Dumque, rudem præbente modum tibicine Tusco,
> Ludius æquatam ter pede pulsat humum.
>
> Art. Amand. i. 111, 2.

Compare Müller, Etrusker, vol. ii. p. 215.

In describing the origin of the Bacchanalia, Livy says: 'Græcus ignobilis in Etruriam primum venit nullâ cum arte earum, quas multas ad animorum corporumque cultum nobis eruditissima omnium gens invexit, sacrificulus et vates;' xxxix. 8. Livy here alludes to the arts of luxury and industry, in which the Etruscans excelled, and also to their skill in divination and sacred ceremonies. With respect to the former, see Dion. Hal. ix. 16. *ἁβροδίαιτον γὰρ δὴ καὶ πολυτελὲς τὸ τῶν Τυρρηνῶν ἔθνος ἦν, οἴκοι τε καὶ ἐπὶ στρατοπέδου, ἐπισπασάμενον ἔξω τῶν ἀναγκαίων πλούτου τε καὶ τέχνης ἔργα παντοῖα πρὸς ἡδονὰς μεμηχανημένα καὶ τρυφάς.* With respect to the latter, see Livy, v. 1: gens ante omnes alias eo magis dedita religionibus, quod excelleret arte colendi eas.

ever had any dramatic or epic poetry; their language, equally remote from the Greek and the Latin, and totally unintelligible to us, was never moulded into any poetical form:(60) nor indeed do we hear of any literary work composed in the Etruscan tongue—unless some ritual books and some collections of prophecies deserve that name.(61) There is nothing to make it probable that the Etruscans possessed any historical works; or that the events of their own country were registered by contemporary annalists. The Etruscan histories, alluded to by Varro, were probably fantastic superstitious inventions, the senseless jargon of a mock theological science, similar to the astrological productions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; in which the existence of the nation was divided into secular periods, and the portents which bounded these periods were designated.(62) A specimen of the learning which they contained is preserved in Plutarch's Life of Sylla, and relieves us from all regret for their loss.(63)

---

(60) Varro de Ling. Lat., v. § 55, after giving the etymologies of the three names Tatienses, Ramnenses, and Luceres, proceeds thus: 'Sed omnia hæc vocabula Tusca, ut Volnius, qui tragœdias Tuscas scripsit, dicebat.' Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 135, says that 'these tragedies may indeed have been a mere exercise of ingenuity, with which the nation had no concern.' Volnius appears to have been a person with whom Varro had conversed, and perhaps these Tuscan tragedies were not composed in the Tuscan language. Compare Müller, Etrusker, vol. ii. p. 281—7.

Niebuhr remarks that there was no affinity between the Etruscan and the Latin, Greek, or Oscan; Hist. vol. i. p. 111, 12. As to the Etruscan language being unintelligible to a Roman, see Müller, ib. vol. i. p. 66.

Dionysius says that Mucius Scævola could speak the Etruscan language, having learnt it from an Etruscan nurse; v. 28. It is implied, that, but for this circumstance, he could not have made himself understood in Porsena's camp. Similar anecdotes are related in Livy, ix. 36; x. 4. Gellius, xi. 7, tells a story of a Roman using some obsolete words in a speech, which puzzled his hearers, and afterwards caused them to laugh, just as if he had introduced some Etruscan or Gaulish expression: 'post deinde, quasi nescio quid Tusce aut Gallice dixisset, universi riserunt.'

(61) Non Tyrrhena retro volventem carmina frustra
Indicia occultæ divûm perquirere mentis.
Lucret. vi. 380, 1.

Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 341, thinks that these lines allude to verses in the Etruscan language, which is indicated by the word *retro*, meaning from right to left. At all events, prophetic or holy verses, similar to the Sibylline verses, are doubtless signified.

Festus. p. 285, says: 'Rituales nominantur Etruscorum libri, in quibus præscriptum est, quo ritu condantur urbes, aræ, ædes sacrentur, quâ sanctitate muri, quo jure portæ, quomodo tribus, curiæ, centuriæ distribuantur, exercitus constituantur, ordinentur, ceteraque ejusmodi ad bellum ac pacem pertinentia.' 'Haruspicini et fulgurales et tonitruales libri' of the Etruscans are mentioned by Cic. de Div. i. 33.

In the speech of the Emperor Claudius, preserved on bronze plates, at Lyons, a version of the adventures of Servius Tullius, different from that followed by the Roman historians, is cited from Etruscan authorities.(64) Niebuhr appears to think that Claudius (who was an antiquarian, and composed an Etruscan history) had access to native annals, written by an Etruscan some time in the century beginning with the year 407 B.C.(65) If they were written about the year 360 B.C., they would certainly have been about a century and a-half earlier than the earliest Roman history; but, on the other hand, they would have been at least 200 years posterior to the beginning of the reign of Servius Tullius. Even therefore if we adopt Niebuhr's hypothesis, we shall not be able to place any great reliance on the testimony of such a chronicler.(66) But there is nothing in the words of Claudius which leads to any inference as to the date of the Etruscan authority whom he cites, or as to the language in which he wrote. Though an Etruscan, he may have written in Latin. In a future chapter, we shall moreover show, that the Etruscan testimony adduced by Claudius is not entitled to credit, and that it affords no reason for believing that authentic accounts of the early period of Rome were preserved in Etruscan writings.(67)

---

(62) Varro ap. Censorin. de die Nat. c. 17. Compare Müller, ib. vol. i. p. 6; vol. ii. p. 286, who supposes them to be as late as the sixth century of Rome.

(63) Plut. Sull. c. 7. Dio Cass. Fragm. 102, ed. Bekker, whose words appear to be taken from Plutarch, though he cites Livy and Diodorus.

(64) Gruter, p. 502, and in several editions of Tacitus. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 717.

(65) Hist. vol. i. p. 381. He says that 'the literature of Etruria was far older than that of Rome; and that the earliest Roman historian must have lived a full century later than the time when the Etruscan annals were composed; if these were written in the 8th secle of their nation.'—In p. 138. he makes the 8th Etruscan sæculum begin in the year 347 U.C.

(66) Afterwards, Niebuhr adds: 'While we take into account that Etruria continued to flourish until the time of Sylla, without losing her national independence, we may also regard it as certain that during all that period there was a succession of annalists, among whom, as among the Roman, the later always knew more than his predecessors, without having any fresh sources of information.'—vol. i. p. 381.

Lastly, it is conjectured by Niebuhr, that Trogus Pompeius, whose Universal History was abridged by Justin, derived from native Massilian chronicles his account of the honorary decrees of the Romans to the Massilians for the friendship which the latter had shown to the Romans during the Gallic war, as well as his information respecting the maritime wars of Massilia against Carthage.(68)

§ 5 We have already seen that, according to Niebuhr, popular poems, combined with funeral panegyrics, formed the groundwork for the original narrative of early Roman history. We must therefore inquire how far the most ancient Roman historians derived their accounts, directly or indirectly, from popular poetry.

This question derives its importance from the hypothesis of Niebuhr, and from the arguments with which he and other later writers have supported this view. Perizonius, indeed, a Dutch philologist of the seventeenth century, in his Animadversiones Historicæ,(69) had conjectured that the early Roman history was derived from a poetical origin; but his remark had attracted no attention; and before the publication of Niebuhr's work, popular poems would not have occupied a place among the sources of the Roman history of the first five centuries. Thus Hooke, in his Dissertation already cited (which contains a review of the writings of Beaufort and his opponents), enumerating these sources, mentions the various classes of annals and public documents, to which he adds family memorials and funeral orations;(70) but he says nothing of popular poems. The hypothesis of Niebuhr has however been placed by him in so specious and attractive a form, and has obtained the assent of writers of so high an authority,(71) that it will require a full investigation. In examining this hypothesis, we shall, consistently with the object of our inquiry, regard it merely in its relation to historical evidence: with its æsthetical bearings, as a question of taste and poetical feeling, we have at present no concern.

---

(67) Below, ch. xi. § 31. Compare Niebuhr. Lect. vol. i. p. 100, 1, 115, where a lower estimate of the credibility of the Etruscan chronicles is taken.

(68) Ib. p. 254.

(69) Compare Corssen, Origines Poesis Romanæ (Berlin, 1846), p. 112, n. 1.

(70) Diss. p. xxxix. Becker still assigns them a very limited and subordinate place in his enumeration of the sources of the early Roman history: vol. i. p. 36.

The hypothesis that the early Roman history was, to a considerable extent, derived from popular poems which were anterior to Nævius and Ennius, and had been forgotten before the flourishing age of Roman literature, rests partly on positive evidence, and partly on conjecture and arguments from analogy.(72) We will commence our inquiry with the former portion of the subject, giving the precedence to the more direct proofs.

Cato (as quoted by Cicero in three places) stated in his *Origines*, that it was the custom at Rome, many centuries before his time, for those who partook in a banquet to sing, in succession, the praises of celebrated men, to the music of the pipe.(73)

A similar account is given by Valerius Maximus, about 200 years afterwards, who says that it was formerly the custom for elderly persons in banquets to recite, to the sound of the pipe, verses commemorating the great deeds of their ancestors, in order to awaken the emulation of the young. Valerius Maximus prefers those lessons to any foreign discipline, and thinks that this was the school in which such men as Camillus, Fabricius, Fabius, Marcellus, and Scipio were trained.(74)

---

(71) The writers who have adopted the hypothesis of Niebuhr, and those who have rejected it, are enumerated by Schwegler, vol. i. p. 53-4. He says that it may be considered at present as generally abandoned. To the writers cited by him, may be added Mr. Macaulay, in the preface to his Lays, who has placed Niebuhr's hypothesis in a very advantageous form, and Dr. Arnold, who has adopted it in his History.

(72) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 254—61; Lect. vol. i. p. xiii—xix; p. 6—9.

(73) Sero igitur a nostris poetæ vel cogniti vel recepti. Quamquam est in Originibus solitos esse in epulis canere convivas ad tibicinem de clarorum hominum virtutibus: honorem tamen huic generi non fuisse declarat oratio Catonis, in quâ objecit, ut probrum, M. Nobiliori, quod is in provinciam poetas duxisset. Duxerat autem consul ille in Ætoliam, ut scimus, Ennium. Tusc. Disp. i. 2. Concerning this charge against M. Fulvius Nobilior, see Meyer, Orat. Rom. Fragm. p. 53. The Scriptor de Vir. Ill., c. 52, says that Ennius his friend celebrated his victory over the Ætolians. 'Gravissimus auctor in Originibus dixit Cato, morem apud majores hunc epularum fuisse, ut deinceps, qui accubarent, canerent ad tibiam clarorum virorum laudes atque virtutes. Ex quo perspicuum est et cantus tum fuisse rescriptos vocum sonis et carmina.'—ib. iv. 2. 'Utinam exstarent illa carmina, quæ multis sæculis ante suam ætatem in epulis esse cantitata a singulis convivis de clarorum virorum laudibus, in Originibus scriptum reliquit Cato.'—Brut. c. 19.

This same custom is alluded to by Horace, who anticipates the time when, under the peaceful sway of Augustus, the Romans, on sacred festivals, will sit over their cups, together with their wives and children; and, after having offered prayers to the gods, will, after the fashion of their fathers, sing to the music of the pipe, verses which celebrate the exploits of brave captains, and the Trojan origin of the city.(75)

Varro, who, like Cato the Elder, was an antiquarian, alluded to this custom in one of his lost works; but he described it under a different form; for instead of saying that the guests of an advanced age recited the verses, he says, that ancient poems were sung by boys, sometimes with, and sometimes without, the accompaniment of the pipe.(76)

---

(74) ii. 1, § 10.

(75) 'Nosque et profestis lucibus, et sacris,
Inter jocosi munera Liberi,
Cum prole, matronisque nostris,
Rite Deos prius apprecati,
Virtute functos, *more patrum*, duces,
Lydis remisto carmine tibiis,
Trojamque, et Anchisen, et almæ
Progeniem Veneris canemus.'—Od. iv. 15.

The presence of the wife and children is particularly noted; because the occasion, though convivial, is sacred, and the children are supposed, according to the remark of Valerius Maximus, to receive a lesson from the verses. With the last part of this passage, we may compare the account which Dante gives of the primitive manners of the Florentines, when they occupied themselves, at home, with their family, in repeating the early legends of their city.

'L'altra, traendo alla rocca la chioma,
Favoleggiava con la sua famiglia
Dei Trojani, e di Fiesole, e di Roma.'—Paradiso, xv. 124.

(76) 'In conviviis pueri modesti [aderant] ut cantarent carmina antiqua, in quibus laudes erant majorum, et assa voce, et cum tibicine.'—Ap. Non. in assa voce. (Vol. i. p. 244, ed. Bipont.)

Mr. Macaulay rightly remarks, Pref. p. 20, that the epithet *modesti* is added in order to mark that the boys were not of the class of musicians who were usually present at the suppers of the Greeks and Romans.

In the passages of Cato and Varro we are deprived of the advantage of reading them with the context; a circumstance which renders their interpretation more difficult. The customs which they severally describe are not identical in their details, but in substance they are equivalent. Varro describes the poems as being sung to the company by a boy, of good reputation, and probably not employed professionally. Cato, on the other hand, represents the guests as themselves singing the verses in succession (*deinceps*). From the latter circumstance, Niebuhr infers that 'the lays, being the common property of the nation, were known to every free citizen:' (77) whereas Corssen, the author of a treatise on the Early Roman Poetry, which obtained a prize at the University of Berlin, rejects this supposition, and conceives that separate poems, relating to persons severally connected with the guests, are intended.(78)

Cato is undoubtedly a witness of high authority (as Cicero calls him) with reference to his own time, and the times immediately preceding him. Moreover, he had investigated the antiquities of his country, and if any authentic accounts of ancient customs had been preserved, he would report them with fidelity. The same may likewise be said of Varro. But it is difficult to conjecture what information even Cato could have possessed with respect to customs prevalent in the early times of Rome, many centuries (as he says) before his own time. Valerius Maximus, in referring to the same custom, conceives it to be within Cato's personal knowledge, for he describes not only Cato's immediate predecessors, as Fabricius, but his contemporaries, as Fabius Maximus, Marcellus, and Scipio, as having been animated to their great deeds by the songs which they had heard in their youth.

Whatever the exact nature, extent, influence, and antiquity of the custom may have been, it seems impossible to attribute to it any great importance with respect to the formation of the early Roman history. That a habit of reciting, on festive and solemn occasions, certain poetical compositions, commemorative of the exploits of their celebrated men, existed among the ancient Romans, is highly probable; and that it may have contributed, together with the funeral orations, to preserve and refresh the memory of the past, need not be doubted; but that the verses thus recited should have served, to any extent, as the foundation of the early Roman history, without the fact being known to Cato, or to any of his successors in the field of history, or being ever alluded to by Cicero, Livy, and Dionysius, the latter of whom carefully enumerates all the sources of the early Roman history, is wholly incredible. If either Cato or Cicero had entertained any suspicion that the custom in question had been attended with such important results, is it likely that in mentioning it they would not have adverted to a subject so interesting to every educated Roman? Moreover, Polybius particularly dwells on the influence of the funeral orations and the exhibition of the ancestorial portraits in stimulating the youth to honourable and patriotic acts, and in creating a love of glory; and he introduces these remarks by saying that the Romans seek by their customs to produce this effect;(79) yet he makes no mention of the songs at banquets, as contributing to the same end.

---

(77) Hist. vol. i. p. 255.

(78) Ibid. p. 116, 7.

But, it is further argued, Ennius, the father of Latin poetry—though of Latin poetry in its polished and secondary form—makes mention of the ancient rude verses, which the native poets had composed before his time. The passage of Ennius, in question, so far as it has been preserved, is as follows: it appears to have stood at the beginning of the seventh book of his *Annales:*

> 'Scripsere alii rem
> Versibus, quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant,
> Quum neque Musarum scopulos quisquam superarat,
> Nec dicti studiosus erat.' [80]

---

(79) Polyb. vi. 52—5. The expressions of Polybius, in speaking of the funeral orations, closely resemble those of Valerius Maximus, in describing the effect of the old patriotic songs.

(80) See Cic. Brut. 18, 19; Orator, c. 51; De Div. i. 50; Varro de L. L. vii. § 36; Quintilian. ix. 4, § 115; Scriptor de Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 4. Compare Ennii Annalium Fragmenta, p. 88. ed. Spangenberg; and for an explanation of the passage, see Corssen, ib. p. 164; Bernhardy, Röm. Litt. p. 166.

This passage, as we learn from Cicero, contains the apology of Ennius, for either omitting, or only touching slightly on, the First Punic War, in his Annals. The subject, he says, had been already occupied by a poet, who wrote in Saturnian metre; in verses such as the Fauns and religious poets used to chant, when no one had climbed the rocks of the Greek Muses, or had studied the graces of speech.

Nævius had, before the time of Ennius, written a poem on the First Punic War, in Saturnian metre.(81) Ennius, a native of Calabria, a semi-Greek, composed his *Annales* in hexameter verses, innovating upon the previous practice of Latin versifiers, and introducing for the first time that Greek metre into Roman literature. To this change he alludes in the passage just quoted, boasting that he was the first to open the gates, and speaking,(82) in a contemptuous and disparaging tone, of the rude strains of his predecessor;(83) though, as Cicero says, he nevertheless thought it prudent to abstain from retreading the ground over which Nævius had travelled, in poetry, not undeserving of praise, though less polished than that of Ennius.(84)

In characterizing the poem of Nævius, his more refined successor classes it with such verses as the Fauns and the *Vates* used to chant. The meaning which Ennius intended to convey by this often quoted passage, may be traced with tolerable distinctness.

---

(81) See Nævii Fragmenta, ed. Klussmann, p. 32.

(82) Cicero, Orator, c. 51, quotes from Ennius the words, 'Nos ausi reserare.' Hence the passage has been thus restored on conjecture—

'Nos ausi reserare fores, nos fecimus longos
Versus.'

Although this restoration is of no authority, it probably represents pretty correctly the meaning of the original. We know from Cic. Leg. ii. 27, that Ennius called heroic verses *longi versus*. The words 'nos ausi reserare,' have been supposed to allude to a passage in Nævius; but the allusion seems imaginary. See Ennii Fragm. p. 90; Næv. Fragm. p. 79.

(83) Ennio licuit vetera contemnenti dicere. Orator, ib. Sit Ennius sane, ut est certe, perfectior; qui si illum, ut simulat, contemneret, &c. Brut. c. 19.

(84) Niebuhr. Lect. vol. ii. p. 208, speaks of 'the great poem of Nævius' in the Saturnian rhythm; and adds: 'that he was a great poet, we may believe on the assertion of Cicero.' Cicero, however, only says that his 'Bellum Punicum, quasi Myronis opus, delectat.'—Brut. 19. and lower down, in comparing Nævius with Ennius: '*Scripsere*, inquit, *alii rem versibus;* et luculente quidem scripserunt, etiamsi minus quam tu polite.' Horace describes the Romans of his time as being familiar with the poetry of Nævius. Ep. ii. 1, 53. See Bernhardy, ib. p. 358.

The Fauns were native Italian deities, who were supposed to haunt the forests and other wild places.(85) They had semi-animal and semi-human forms, and they belonged to the same class as Pan,(86) and the Satyrs, in the Greek mythology. In this character, they were connected with the rude songs of shepherds and husbandmen.(87) They were, at the same time, viewed as endowed with prophetic powers: the voices presaging good or evil fortune, which were heard in lone spots, or even in the throng of the battle, were attributed to them.(88) Faunus gave oracles in a lonely grove, near Albunea; and Fatua the wife of Faunus, had a spirit of divination.(89)

---

(85) Virgil, Ecl. vi. 27, represents the Fauns and the wild animals as dancing to the song of Silenus. In the Georgics, he calls the Fauns rural deities, and combines them with the wood-nymphs:

'Et vos agrestum præsentia numina Fauni,
Ferte simul Faunique pedem Dryadesque puellæ.'
Georg. i. 10, 11.

Compare Horace, Od. i. 17, iii. 18; Art. Poet. 244. In the curious legend in Ovid's Fasti, iii. 285—330, Picus and Faunus are described as native deities of Italy, and as frequenting the woods, the mountains, and the open country. Compare Plut. Num. 15.

Dionysius, i. 31, 42, describes Faunus as the descendant of Mars, and king of the Aborigines; the Romans (he says) worship him as one of their native deities with sacrifices and songs: *θυσίαις καὶ ᾠδαῖς*. In Virgil Æn. vii. 45—9, Saturn is the father of Picus, Picus of Faunus, and Faunus of Latinus. See below, ch. ix. § 1.

(86) Faunus is considered as the equivalent of the Grecian god Pan. See Ovid, Fast. ii. 267—82, and compare the passage of Lucretius in n. 87. Picus and Faunus resemble the Satyrs and Panes of the Greek mythology, according to Plutarch. Num. 15. He is also closely allied with Sylvanus: Hartung, Religion der Römer, vol. ii. p. 185. Both these are rural deities, who frequent the woods and mountains. Concerning Faunus, see the ample collection of passages in Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, vol. ii. p. 844—8. Also Heyne, Exc. v. ad Æn. vii.

(87) 'Hæc loca capripedes Satyros nymphasque tenere,
Finitimi fingunt, et *Faunos esse loquuntur*,
Quorum noctivago strepitu, ludoque jocanti,
Affirmant vulgo taciturna silentia rumpi,
Chordarumque sonos fieri dulcesque querelas,
Tibia quas fundit, digitis pulsata canentum;
Et genus agricolûm late sentiscere, quum Pan,
Pinea semiferi capitis velamina quassans,
Unco sæpe labro calamos percurrit hiantes,
Fistula sylvestrem ne cesset fundere musam.'
Lucret. iv. 582—91.

(88) See the verses of Lucretius cited above. Dion. Hal., v. 16, says that supernatural appearances causing panic fears, and divine voices disturbing the mind, were attributed by the Romans to Faunus. Sæpe etiam et in præliis Fauni auditi, Cic. de Div. i. 45.

They therefore were conceived as combining the wild and rustic, with the prophetic and oracular character; and accordingly Varro explains the verse of Ennius by saying that the Fauns were accustomed, in sylvan retreats, to deliver prophecies expressed in Saturnian verses.(90) Festus likewise says that the very ancient verses, in which Faunus was believed to have made his predictions, were called Saturnian.(91) The Saturnian metre was even sometimes denominated *Faunian;* from its supposed connexion with the ancient Faunus.(92)

---

(89) See the fine account of the oracle of Faunus, in Virg. Æn. vii. 81. Fauno fuit uxor nomine Fatua, quæ assidue divino spiritu impleta velut per furorem futura præmonebat. Unde adhuc qui inspirari solent, Fatuari dicuntur. Justin. lviii. 1, and other passages in Klausen, ib. p. 848. Concerning the prophetic nature of Faunus, see Heyne, Exc., v. ad Æn. vii.

(90) Fauni dei Latinorum, ita ut Faunus et Fauna sit; hos versibus, quos vocant Saturnios, in silvestribus locis traditum est solitos fari futura, a quo fando Faunos dictos. Varro de L. L. vii. § 36.

Like the Fauns of Italy, Silenus in the Greek mythology combined the character of a coarse reveller in the train of Bacchus, with the gifts of prophecy and wisdom. See the author's Treatise on Methods of Reasoning in Politics, vol. ii. p. 265, n. 78. Compare, on the one hand, Silenus, as described in the 6th Eclogue,

'Inflatum hesterno venas, ut semper, Iaccho,'

and in Ovid, as falling from his ass:

'Pando Silenus asello,
Clamarunt comites, surge, age, surge, pater,'

with Silenus, explaining the phenomena of the universe, or delivering lessons of wisdom: and, on the other hand, compare Faunus, as represented in the story in Ovid, Fast. ii. 303—358, with Faunus the mysterious oracular deity in Virgil, Æn. vii. 81—103. The absence of restraint and self-control, which characterizes prophetic enthusiasm, as well as Bacchanalian indulgence, seems to be the point of union. Hartung, ib. p. 186, infers from the verse of Ennius, that collections of oracular dicta in Saturnian verse, were then in existence.

I am unable to agree with Mr. Macaulay, pref. p. 16, in approving the Euhemeristic supposition of Scaliger, that the Fauns were 'a class of men who exercised in Latium, at a very remote period, the same functions which belonged to the Magians in Persia, and the Bards in Gaul.'

(91) Versus quoque antiquissimi, quibus Faunus fata cecinisse hominibus videtur, Saturnii appellantur; quibus et a Nævio bellum Punicum scriptum est, et a multis aliis plura composita sunt. Festus, in Saturno, p. 325.

(92) See Mar. Victorin. Gramm. iii. 18, p. 190, ed. Gaisford. In a gloss of Placidus quoted by Bernhardy, Röm. Litt. p. 166, from Mai Coll. Vat. tom. iii. p. 462, a different origin of this appellation is given. 'Faunorum modorum, antiquissimorum versuum, *quibus Faunus celebratur*.' In the following well-known passage of Horace, the rugged unpolished

The *Vates* intended by Ennius were doubtless religious and oracular poets, like Marcius the *Vates*, whose prophecies in the Second Punic War are cited by Livy,(93) and like the *Vates*, whose ancient writings are enumerated by Horace among the primitive remains of Roman antiquity.(94) Ennius therefore in this verse seems to allude chiefly to the sacred and oracular poetry of Rome and Latium, composed in rugged unpolished Saturnian metre; which he classes with the historical poem of Nævius on the First Punic War, and opposes jointly with that poem, to his own hexameter *Annales*, imitated from the classical Greek models.

This passage therefore cannot be considered as proving the existence of historical poems, in Latium, earlier than Nævius and Ennius.

A proof of the preservation of ancient songs relative to Romulus and Remus is found in a passage of Dionysius, where he reports the account of the birth and early years of the twins given by Fabius Pictor. It has hence been thought that the chanting of these songs, which is described as an existing practice, refers to the time of Fabius, and not of Dionysius himself. It appears however from the context, that Dionysius alludes to his own time, and describes a contemporary custom.(95)

---

character of the Saturnian verse, its connexion with the country, and its opposition to the Greek metres, by which it was supplanted, are all clearly marked.

> 'Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes
> Intulit agresti Latio. Sic horridus ille
> Defluxit numerus Saturnius, et grave virus
> Munditiæ pepulere; sed in longum tamen ævum
> Manserunt, hodieque manent, *vestigia ruris.*'
>
> Ep. ii. 1, 156—60.

The *vestigia ruris* in these verses coincide with the idea expressed by the *Fauni* of Ennius. Concerning rude rustic verses at harvest, see Virg. Georg. ii. 386; Klotz. p. 284.

(93) Livy, xxv. 12. Compare Egger. Lat. Serm. Rel. p. 110—2.

(94)
> 'Sic fautor veterum, ut tabulas peccare vetantes,
> Quas bis quinque viri sanxerunt, fœdera regum
> Vel Gabiis vel cum rigidis æquata Sabinis,
> Pontificum libros, *annosa volumina vatum*,
> Dictitet Albano Musas in monte locutas.'
>
> Hor. Ep. ii. 1, 23—7.

Compare Corssen, ib. p. 7—15. The passage of Ennius is fully explained by Bernhardy, Röm. Litt. p. 164. 166.

(95) See note A. at the end of the chapter.

No judgment can therefore be formed as to the antiquity of the songs in question: they may perhaps be posterior to the time when the statue of the she-wolf and twins was dedicated in the Capitol, and when the legend had been fully formed. They may have grown out of the legend, and have had no influence in its formation; just as the egg of Leda, which was hung up in a temple of Sparta, and the ivory rib of Pelops, together with many other similar relics preserved in Greek and Roman temples, were the consequence of fabulous legends respecting gods and heroes, and not their cause.(96)

The nænia, a song of lament chanted at funerals, generally by hired women, has been enumerated among the poems which formed the basis of the early Roman history:(97) but although these dirges may have celebrated the praises of eminent men, they were doubtless for the most part unworthy of the name of regular compositions, and the memory of them could scarcely survive the day of the funeral.(98) The funeral oration, or the poems sung at banquets, would be more likely to become a permanent record of the fame of the deceased.

The utmost extent, therefore, of the direct and positive evidence is to prove that at an early time, poems, or ballads, commemorating the praises of the great men of the Republic, were sung at banquets and on other festive or solemn occasions. There is nothing to show that any classical writer on Roman antiquity believed, or suspected, that poems of this kind contributed, in any material degree, to the formation of the early Roman history. The hypothesis of Niebuhr, however, not only supplies this link, but it also furnishes a detailed scheme of the poems out of which much of the received narrative of events for the first three or four centuries is represented as having been constructed.

---

(96) On ancient relics, see Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript., tom. vi. p. 84.

(97) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 256; Lect. vol. i. p. 10.

(98) Nænia est carmen, quod in funere laudandi gratiâ cantatur ad tibiam; Festus, p. 163; cf. p. 161. 'Nænia ineptum et inconditum carmen, quod adducta pretio mulier, quæ præfica diceretur, iis quibus propinqui non essent mortuis exhiberet.' 'Præficæ dicebantur apud veteres quæ adhiberi solent funeri mercede conductæ, ut et flerent et fortia facta laudarent.' Nonius in vv. Compare Cic. de Leg. ii. 24. See Corssen, ib. p. 103; Hartung, vol. i. p. 288; Streuber, ib. p. 10.

A goddess *Nænia* was personified out of this funeral lament; Hartung, vol. ii. p. 246.

In the first place, he considers nearly the entire history of the Roman kings as having been formed from poems into a prose narrative. The reign of Romulus, from the establishment of the Asylum to his marvellous death, is (with the exception of some prosaic details on the Etruscan wars) described as forming one continuous epic poem.(99) On Numa, it appears, there were only short lays;(100) but Tullus Hostilius the third king, the story of the Horatii, and the destruction of Alba—events which belong to his reign—formed an epical whole, like the poem on Romulus.(101)

In the reign of Ancus Marcius, there is no appearance of poetical colouring, and everything happens according to the ordinary course of nature. It forms therefore a breach in this series of historical poetry.(102) 'But with L. Tarquinius Priscus (Niebuhr proceeds to say) a great poem begins, which ends with the battle of Regillus, and this lay of the Tarquins, even in its prose shape, is still inexpressibly poetical; nor is it less unlike real history. The arrival of Tarquinius the Lucumo at Rome; his exploits and victories; his death; then the marvellous story of Servius; Tullia's unholy marriage; the murder of the just king; the whole story of the last Tarquinius; the warning presages of his fall; Lucretia; the assumed idiocy of Brutus; his death; the war with Porsenna; finally the truly Homeric battle of Regillus; all this forms an epic poem, which in power and brilliance of imagination leaves everything produced by the Romans in later times far behind it.'(103)

---

(99) Hist. vol. i. p. 220—237, 258.

(100) Hist. vol. i. p. 237—40, 258.

(101) Ib. p. 258, 346—52. Elsewhere. he says that the purely fabulous and poetical portion of Roman story ends with Numa; and that with Tullus Hostilius the mythico-historical, or semi-historical period begins; ib. p. 246—8; Lect. vol. i. p. 41.

(102) Ib. p. 259, 352—6.

(103) Hist. vol. i. p. 259. Compare p. 357—71: 'The Lay of L. Tarquinius Priscus, and Servius Tullius.' In p. 488—509, the ancient legend of the last Tarquin is recounted. In p. 510, he speaks of attempting to

A similar hypothesis is made by Niebuhr with respect to some portions of the subsequent history. Thus the adventures of Coriolanus are traced by him to a 'heroic poem:'(104) and the exploits of Cincinnatus against the Æquians are derived from a like source.(105) The account of the siege of Veii is moreover described as founded in great part upon a narrative poem; though some other prose account of this war is stated to have existed.(106)

---

restore 'the outlines of the old lost poem.' For the war with Porsenna, and the battle of Regillus, see ib. p. 541—52. Concerning the termination of the 'Lay of the Tarquins,' see p. 558; and Lect. vol. i. p. 124.

(104) 'Poetical invention seems to have allowed itself free scope in this story; and so the whole of it must be excluded from history. . . . . The battle fought by Cn. Marcius before a town, which he takes with his own hand, is an idea belonging to an heroic poem.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 243. 'The whole story of Coriolanus is neither more nor less than a poem, in which a series of events belonging to various years is referred to one man and to one period.' Lect. vol. i. p. 175.

The words of Dionysius respecting Coriolanus—*ᾄδεται καὶ ὑμνεῖται πρὸς ἁπάντων ὡς εὐσεβὴς καὶ δίκαιος ἀνήρ*, viii. 62—are understood by Corssen, ib. p. 101, to refer to sacred songs; but it is evident that they have no such reference, and that the meaning simply is that 'he is celebrated by all as a pious and just man.' The passage is so construed by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 239, who in general is not slow in discovering allusions to poetry which are invisible to ordinary eyes.

(105) 'The task of relieving the besieged army had been transferred to a celebrated name by a very highly wrought poetical legend. . . . . . The contents of this poem are unquestionably very old.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 261. 'This legend will not stand the test of historical criticism, any more than those which refer to the time of the kings. But such a test must not be applied to it, any more than to them. The poet, whether he sang his story or told it, had no need to reflect,' &c. ib. p. 268. Compare Lect. vol. i. p. 181. 2.

(106) 'Thus far we have the simple narrative of the war, as it was given by the Annals. Their account of the capture of the city has been entirely supplanted by a *poetical story*, belonging to the lay or legend, whichever one may choose to call it, of Camillus; *an epic narrative*, the features of which are irreconcilable with history, and which extends from this period down to the last victory over the Gauls by the Alban Mount, forming a whole, still preserved, at least in substance, under a biographical form, in Plutarch. In this legend Veii is the Roman Ilion: from it came the story that the siege lasted ten years: it is by the same legend that the destiny of the city is connected with the prodigy of the Alban lake; that the gods themselves are represented as interfering to decide it; and that the fate of the victorious general and the conquering people are made to result, as an expiation for their excessive prosperity, from the fall of Veii. Henceforth we are no longer standing on historical ground: I shall relate *this poem* like the rest, restoring its original substance.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 475. Compare pp. 471, 480, 481, where other allusions to the poetical character of the legend occur.

In his Lectures, the same hypothesis is reproduced in the following

The adventures which gave to T. Manlius his surname of Torquatus, and to M. Valerius his surname of Corvus, in the years 367 and 348 B.C., are considered as founded on heroic lays, and as proving that the heroes of Rome were even at this late period the themes of song.(107) A marvellous story of a gigantic youth, who assisted the Romans in a battle against the Bruttians and Lucanians in the year 282 B.C., and was believed to be the god Mars, is declared to be the last episode in Roman history that belongs to poetry.(108)

Niebuhr considers the poems which narrated the early history, and particularly that of the kings, to be anterior to Ennius, but to be later than the Gallic conflagration. The middle of the fifth century of the city, about the year 304 B.C., at the end of the Second Samnite War, is supposed by him to be the flourishing period of this præ-Ennian epic or ballad poetry. It was, he thinks, distinguished by its plebeian, and anti-patrician spirit: but notwithstanding this character, which would have rendered the poems acceptable to the great bulk of the Roman community, Ennius, who was blind to their merits, succeeded in suppressing them.(109)

---

form: 'The war of Veii presented to the ancients a parallel to the Trojan war; the siege was believed to have lasted ten years; and the taking of the city was as marvellous as that of Troy by the wooden horse. But the account of the whole war is not fictitious; the ancient songs took up isolated historical points, which they worked out and embellished, *and this constitutes the difference between them and the lays of the earliest history.* An annalistic narrative which is by no means incredible, runs parallel to these lays. The defeat of the tribunes Virginius and Sergius is historical, but the detail about the Alban lake, and the like, belongs to historical tradition, and must be taken as the ancients give them: whether they were composed in prose or in verse is a matter of no consequence.' He then gives a summary of the narrative of the last three years of the siege, and adds: 'This is very pretty poetry, and if we examine the historical nonsense of this account, we cannot hesitate for a moment to believe in the existence of a poem;' Lect. vol. i. p. 245, 6. The defeat of Virginius and Sergius, which Niebuhr singles out as historical, is described in Livy, v. 8, 9.

(107) Hist. vol. iii. p. 76, 80; Lect. vol. i. p. 308; below, ch. xiii. § 13.

(108) Hist. vol. iii. p. 437. The story is taken from Val. Max., i. 8, 6.

(109) Hist. vol. i. p. 259—61. Mr. Macaulay supposes his Lay of Horatius to have been made about the year 360 U.C.=394 B.C., four years before the Gallic conflagration. He supposes his Lay of Virginia to have been sung in 382 U.C.=372 B.C., and his Lay of the Battle of Regillus to

Such is an outline of Niebuhr's hypothesis with respect to the derivation of the early Roman history from popular epic poems, or narrative ballads. We will proceed to inquire how far it accords with the facts of the case, and whether it is entitled to the praise of explaining numerous and unconnected circumstances by a simple and consistent theory.

The first point to be considered is, under what aspect does this hypothesis regard a poem, and what are the characteristic features of poetry by which its presence, in an altered and compounded state, is recognised?

A poem, in strictness of speech, is nothing more than a composition in metre.(110) However prosaic the spirit of the composition may be, we call it a poem, if it is written in a metrical form. The Works and Days of Hesiod, the Admonitions of Theognis, and Akenside's Pleasures of the Imagination, are poems, because they are written in verse. A large part of the work of Lucretius is only entitled to the name of a poem, because it consists of hexameter verses. On the other hand, such compositions as the novels of Boccaccio, Télémaque, and the Pilgrim's Progress, are prose works, and not poems. No historian of literature, or bibliographical writer, would hesitate in classing Scott's Lord of the Isles and Manzoni's Adelchi with

---

have been sung in 451 u.c.=303 B.C., twenty-two years before the landing of Pyrrhus in Italy. These imaginary dates agree with Niebuhr's hypothesis. The hypothesis of Niebuhr respecting the formation of the historical poetry in the fifth century of the city, and its plebeian character, is examined and rejected by Corssen; ib. p. 176—81.

(110) Lord Bacon, in his Advancement of Learning, b. 2, distinguishes between the matter and the form of poetry; between poetry considered as subject to the restraints of metre, and poetry considered merely as *feigned history*. 'Poesy is a part of learning in measure of words for the most part restrained, but in all other points extremely licensed, and doth truly refer to the imagination. . . . . It is taken in two senses, in respect of *words*, or *matter*. In the first sense it is but a character of style, and belongeth to arts of speech; in the latter it is, as hath been said, one of the principal portions of learning, and is nothing else but feigned history, which may be styled as well in prose as in verse.' The low and unambitious style which is proper to prose, in distinction to the elevated tone and aspiring flight of poetry, is designated by the terms *πεζὸς λόγος* and *sermo pedester*. Prose writers go *χάμαι καὶ βαδὴν*; Lucian, Pro Imag. 17. In like manner *πεζὸς*, as applied to a journey by land, is opposed to a journey by sea, where a ship is *μετάρσιος* or *μετέωρος*.

poems, or the Bride of Lammermoor and the Promessi Sposi of these authors with prose works. It is the form of a composition, not its matter, which decides whether it is, or is not, a poem.

At the same time, there is a certain cast of thought and tone of feeling, a certain selection of images and thoughts, a certain mode of treating a subject, and a certain character of language, which distinguish good poetry, and which are therefore properly regarded as poetical. These qualities belong to the matter, not to the form of a composition, and are, in themselves, independent of the metre. Hence there may be prosaic poetry, and poetical prose: that is to say, there may be a poem which is deficient in the characteristic excellences of poetry, and there may be a prose composition which possesses them, so far as they can exist without the aid of metre. Hence too a poem may be rendered into another language, either in verse or in prose: in the latter case it ceases to be a poem, though it retains whatever poetical characteristics, independent of metre, it may possess.

When Horace speaks of discerning the 'disjecti membra poetæ' in a passage of Ennius, after it has been deprived of its metre, he means to say that, even in the form of prose, it still retains its poetical features.(111)

Now in supporting the Niebuhrian hypothesis respecting epic or ballad poetry as the foundation of the early Roman history, sometimes the one, and sometimes the other, of these attributes of a poem (which are nevertheless very different) is adopted as the criterion. At one time, the romantic, marvellous, heroic character of the incidents, their remoteness from everyday life, their pathos, beauty, or sublimity, their poetical character, without reference to any metrical considerations, is insisted on, as proving that the narrative was derived ultimately from a poem. At other times, an attempt is made to show that certain fragments of metrical composition, remnants of the ancient poem, have been preserved; though they are totally devoid of the poetical character, and were never, until this theory was propounded, distinguished from the prose text of the histories in which they are imbedded.

---

(111) Non satis est puris versum perscribere verbis;
Quem si dissolvas, quivis stomachetur eodem
Quo personatus pacto pater. His, ego quæ nunc,
Olim quæ scripsit Lucilius, eripias si
Tempora certa modosque, et quod prius ordine verbum est
Posterius facias, præponens ultima primis;
Non ut si solvas, 'Postquam discordia tetra
Belli ferratos postes portasque refregit,'
Invenias etiam disjecti membra poetæ.
Sat. i. 4, v. 54—62.

The argument derived from the poetical character of the early Roman history, is stated in so forcible, and at the same time so comprehensive a manner, by Mr. Macaulay, that its effect could not fail to be weakened, if it were not expressed in his own words.

'The early history of Rome is indeed far more poetical than anything else in Latin literature. The loves of the Vestal and the God of War, the cradle laid among the reeds of Tiber, the fig-tree, the she-wolf, the shepherd's cabin, the recognition, the fratricide, the rape of the Sabines, the death of Tarpeia, the fall of Hostus Hostilius, the struggle of Mettus Curtius through the marsh, the women rushing with torn raiment and dishevelled hair between their fathers and their husbands, the nightly meetings of Numa and the nymph by the well in the sacred grove, the fight of the three Romans and the three Albans, the purchase of the Sibylline books, the crime of Tullia, the simulated madness of Brutus, the ambiguous reply of the Delphian oracle to the Tarquins, the wrongs of Lucretia, the heroic actions of Horatius Cocles, of Scævola, and of Clœlia, the battle of Regillus won by the aid of Castor and Pollux, the defence of Cremera, the touching story of Coriolanus, the still more touching story of Virginia, the wild legend about the draining of the Alban lake, the combat between Valerius Corvus and the gigantic Gaul, are among the many instances which will at once suggest themselves to every reader.

'In the narrative of Livy, who was a man of fine imagination, these stories retain much of their genuine character. Nor could even the tasteless Dionysius distort and mutilate them into mere prose. The poetry shines, in spite of him, through the dreary pedantry of his eleven books. It is discernible in the most tedious and in the most superficial modern works on the early times of Rome. It enlivens the dulness of the Universal History, and gives a charm to the most meagre abridgments of Goldsmith.'(112)

The marks by which Niebuhr recognises the lost Lay of the Tarquins—a composition which he declares to be in its prose shape inexpressibly poetical—are of a similar character. They are traces of lofty conception, of brilliant imagery, of vivid colouring, of fertile invention; but not of metrical form.(113) So again, in commenting on the well-known incident in the story of Tarpeia, which represents her as dazzled by the gold bracelets and collars of the Sabine soldiers, he makes a remark dictated by a similar spirit. 'The Roman poet (he says) conceived that the poor Sabines were covered with gold, as Fauriel observes that the bards of modern Greece conceive of their clephts. Here the marks of popular poetry are so clear, that none who have eyes can mistake them, It is in the very spirit that created all the splendour and the treasures in the house of Menelaus.'(114) In this passage the fanciful and unreal character of the incident is alone held sufficient to stamp it as coming from a metrical source. The poetical nature of the narrative is taken as conclusive evidence of its derivation from a poem.

Can it, however, be laid down generally, that poetical images and incidents never exist without a metrical original, and are never found without the limits of a poem? Is it safe to infer, from the poetical character of a narrative, that it was derived from a composition in verse, and not in prose?

Numerous instances will at once occur to the memory, where such an inference would lead to erroneous results. Much of the Greek mythology was taken from the early epic poetry; but much of it likewise existed in the form of traditionary legends, propagated by repetition, and not reduced into a metrical form. Many of the stories reduced to writing by the early logographers, and by other prose writers down to the time of Pausanias, together with many adopted by the lyric poets and the tragedians, as the themes of their compositions, fulfilled all the conditions which this hypothesis assumes to be evidence of a poem. They abounded with striking, pathetic, and interesting events; they often deviated from the course of nature; they were distinguished by brilliancy of imagination, and variety of incidents. Yet their original form was that of a prose legend; and the work of the poet was of subsequent date. The story of the Argonauts, for example, from the first departure of the speaking ship, to the revenge of Medea upon Jason's children, is full of poetical situations, images, and characters. Nevertheless, it did not originate in any poem; nor have we any reason to believe that Euripides and Apollonius Rhodius were assisted by any previous poets in their treatment of the subject.

---

(112) Ib. Pref. p. 6.
(113) Hist. vol. i. p. 259. See above, p. 212.
(114) Hist. vol. i. p. 229. note 632.

The tales of fiction which are related by Boccaccio, and other of the Italian novelists, and which have furnished materials for many poetical works, were of prose origin, and did not come from any metrical source. Many of these stories are in the highest degree poetical; they abound with touches of tenderness, of sublimity, and of passion; they are distinguished by variety and novelty of incident. They have been used by Shakspeare, Dryden, and other great poets, as the groundwork of their compositions; but although they thus assumed the form of poems, they were, in their original prose form, full of poetical materials. It will scarcely be denied that the Arabian Nights are replete with poetical fancy and invention; that they teem with the luxuriance of Oriental fiction, without being deformed by its wildness and extravagance. Yet the Arabian Nights are prose narratives, like so many other of the Eastern stories. The fictitious world created by the Rosicrucian philosophy, as it is called: the gnomes, sylphs, undines, and salamanders—the semi-human nymphs waiting for the love which is to endow them with a soul—form a circle of poetical imagery, rising above the laws of nature, and attractive to the fancy. Yet, when Pope introduced them into the Rape of the Lock, he invested them for the first time with the graces of metre, and was the first who engrafted them into poetry.

The mere circumstance of an event being romantic, unusual, and therefore improbable, does not authorize us to consider it a creation of poetical fiction, though it may be poetical in its features. The story of Lucretia is considered by Niebuhr as a fictitious incident, forming part of the epic Lay of the Tarquins;(115) and it is included by Mr. Macaulay in his list of events in the early Roman history, which bear marks of originating in poems.(116) The external evidence for the story of Lucretia is so imperfect, that it cannot be considered as a historical fact. But if it were sufficiently attested, it would be not less credible than the similar story of Virginia, which is later in date, and has more claim to be considered historical; though it is long anterior to contemporary history.

There are however other stories in Roman history, subsequent to the period of contemporaneous registration, and resting on adequate evidence, but which are not less romantic than those of Lucretia and Virginia. Such for example is the act of Ortiagon's wife, in the Asiatic war of Cn. Manlius, against the Gauls, in 189 B.C., which, though marked with barbarian cruelty, was a heroic vengeance for the violation of her chastity;(117) and such was the measure of determined suicide, by which Archo, the wife of Poris the Thessalian, withdrew her husband's and sister's children from pollution and outrage.(118) The suicide of Cleopatra is an event belonging to a period of Roman history, which was as much the subject of contemporary registration as the time of the Crusades; an event in which, nevertheless, both poets and painters have recognised a subject for their art.

---

(115) Above, p. 212.

(116) Above, p. 217.

(117) Polyb. xxii. 21; Livy. xxxviii. 24; Flor. ii. 11; Val. Max. vi. 1, ext. 2; Scriptor de Vir. Ill. c. 55.

(118) Livy, xl. 4.

Even the meeting of Scipio and Asdrubal at the court and table of Syphax, though it has not the tragic interest which belongs to the stories just recited, is in the highest degree romantic and improbable, and might fairly be suspected of being borrowed from fiction, if it did not rest on authentic testimony.(119)

Perhaps we may be permitted to remark, that Mr. Macaulay is one of the last persons who should treat brilliant and striking passages in a prose history, glowing with poetical warmth, and diversified with poetical imagery, as proofs of a metrical original. If passages of this sort are to be accepted as evidence of derivation from a concealed poem, he must submit to be deprived of the honours of the authorship of much of his own historical compositions.

There is nothing in the fictitious part of the early Roman history which may not be accounted for, by supposing that it consists of legends, floating in the popular memory, composed of elements partly real, but chiefly unreal, and moulded into a connected form as they passed from mouth to mouth, the picturesque, interesting, or touching incidents being selected, and the whole grouped and coloured by the free pencil of tradition. Even these legends, doubtless, would be improved and polished by the successive historians through whose hands they passed, after they had been once reduced into writing. Such an origin would account for their poetical features, without supposing them derived from a metrical original—from a poem, in the proper sense of the word.

It appears, indeed, that between the publication of his first and second volumes, Niebuhr felt the force of this objection to his theory; for at the beginning of his second volume he presents his hypothesis in a modified form; declaring that the assumption of a poem, or metrical composition, is not a necessary part of his theory, and admitting that some of the legends may have originally been circulated in the form, not of verse, but of prose.(120)

---

(119) See Livy. xxviii. 18; xxx. 13; Appian. Hist. Rom. vi. 29, 30.

The theory, thus modified, becomes however, essentially different. Not only the metrical, but even the epical character of the poems, out of which the early history was in part formed, was a characteristic feature of the first hypothesis.(121) If the narratives, upon which the early history was founded, were not poems—if they were not compositions in verse, or in metre—the hypothesis loses all its peculiarity, novelty, and interest, and becomes a mere question of words. At the same time, it should be observed, that the arguments deduced from the passages of Ennius, Cato, and Varro, cease to be applicable; for these writers refer distinctly to verses, and the compositions which they describe are not meant to be in prose.

---

(120) 'The same thing has happened among every people whose annals were a mere dry catalogue of events: and not only does the imagination in such cases mould a subject taken from history with the same freedom and plastic power as one created by poetry; but the characters have incidents, which elsewhere are told of others, transferred, and often purely arbitrary fictions ascribed to them; which gain credit, like Charlemagne's pretended expedition to the Holy Land. Such legends, whether concerning the personages of history, or those of poetry, were equally termed *fabulæ*. That at Rome, as elsewhere, they shaped themselves in verse,—that the virtue of Coriolanus, and the victories of Camillus, were sung in the same manner as the First Punic War,—does not to my feelings admit of a doubt. If the bards are nameless, so are those of the Nibelungen and the Cid. *But the rhythmical form is a secondary matter.* The main point is, that we should recognise how the very stories which speak to the feelings are those which tradition treats freely and creatively; how it does not give back the chain of incidents one by one, as it receives them; and how, in proportion as a story is listened to with general interest, it is the more liable to be transformed without any limit, until it becomes fixed in some book; while on the other hand such facts as excite no emotion come down just as they were recorded, to the historian who likes to employ himself in putting some life into them. This is not disputed by scholars whose concurrence I should be loth to forego, yet who think it hazardous to build on the assumption that the Romans had a body of popular poems now lost: and so I will not disturb the consciousness of our being substantially agreed, by labouring to make them adopt the whole of my own conviction. *Besides, I am far from asserting that all those traditions were originally circulated in song:* nor do I doubt that some, which began in verse, were turned into prose-tales, when writing became more and more an employment.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 5. The word *rhythmical*, in this passage, appears to be used by Niebuhr with a sense equivalent to *metrical*.

(121) Niebuhr expresses himself with great confidence on the subject in his first volume. After having mentioned the ballad poetry of England, Scotland, Spain, and Scandinavia, the Nibelungen lied, and the songs of the Servians and modern Greeks, he continues thus: 'If any one does not discern the traces of such lays in the epical part of Roman story, he may continue blind to them: he will be left more and more alone every day: there can be no going backward on this point for generations.' Hist. vol. i. p. 256. Compare his Lectures, vol. i. p. 124.

In proportion as the argument, from the poetical character of the events, is felt to be inconclusive, it is natural that an attempt should be made to strengthen the proof by more direct evidence. Accordingly, some passages are produced which are alleged to be metrical remnants of the identical lost poems, in Saturnian metre, which have been preserved, accidentally, in the text of Livy. This is a legitimate method of proof, and may be illustrated by the fate of the fables of Babrius. This Greek fabulist, who composed Æsopian fables in choliambic verses, and probably lived in the second or third century after Christ, was used by later compilers and copyists as the foundation for their prose versions of Æsop; and his choliambics were accordingly (as it has been expressed) *transprosed* into the brief compositions which have descended to us as Æsopian fables. In some cases this operation was performed so negligently, that fragments of choliambics have been detected in the midst of the prose; whence Bentley, Tyrwhitt, and other critics, were able to recover certain remains of Babrius, before the late discovery of the manuscript of his fables at Mount Athos.(122) These fragments were however recognised exclusively by their metrical form; and although many other of the prose fables are now known to have been mere dry abridgments of the choliambic fables of Babrius, there was no test, except the accidental preservation of metrical fragments, by which that origin could be detected.

One of the passages in question is in Livy's account of the appointment, by Tullus Hostilius, of two criminal judges to try Horatius, for the murder of his sister. Livy proceeds to quote the text of the law regulating this form of trial, which he introduces with the words, 'lex horrendi carminis erat;'(123) and in these words Niebuhr finds an allusion to the ancient poem.(124) The law itself, singularly enough, is the remnant of the lost lyrical poem, and he arranges it, with accents, in the following form:—

---

(122) See the author's preface to his edition of Babrius (London, 1846).

Duúmviri pérduelliónem júdicent.
Si a duúmviris provocárit,
Provocátióne certáto:
Si víncent, caput óbnúbito:
Infélici árbore réste suspéndito:
Vérberato íntra vel éxtra pomoérium.

In the last line, the text of Livy has been altered, without notice to the reader. The original, true to the diffuse style of legal expression, has 'verberato vel intra pomœrium vel extra pomœrium.'(125)

Now, in the first place, the word *carmen* in this context does not signify a poem. It bears the sense of a 'set form of words,' a 'legal formula,' which it not unfrequently conveys in the classical writers.(126)

---

(123) Livy, i. 26.

(124) 'Tullus, the story of the Horatii, and the destruction of Alba, form an epical whole, like the poem on Romulus; indeed Livy has here preserved a fragment of the poem unaltered, in the lyrical numbers of the old Roman verse.' Hist. vol. i. p. 258.

(125) The formula 'vel intra pomœrium vel extra pomœrium' is repeated below, in the speech of the father of Horatius.

(126) 'Præterea dicuntur *carmina* formulæ quædam certis verbis compositæ, ut jurisconsultorum, prætorum, fecialium, imperatorum in obsidione urbium deos evocantium, ac devoventium,' &c. Facciolati, Lex. in v. The following passages (partly cited by Facciolati) will serve to illustrate this use of the word. In reciting the ancient form of making a treaty, Livy says, of the pater patratus: 'Multis id verbis, quæ *longo effata carmine* non operæ est pretium referre, peragit;' where Crevier remarks: 'Carmen hic nihil aliud est, quam certa solemnisque verborum formula.' Lower down he says: 'Sua item *carmina* Albani suumque jusjurandum per suum Dictatorem suosque sacerdotes peregerunt,' where the word has the same meaning. In iii. 65, Livy calls the terms of a tribunitian rogation, 'rogationis carmen.' The words of the rogation, which are recited, 'Si tribunos plebei decem rogabo,' &c., might, by breaking them into short portions, and placing accents over them, be converted into as good Saturnian verse, as the legal formula in the story of Horatius operated upon by Niebuhr. Again the 'dirum quoddam carmen,' to which the Samnite soldiers swear, in Livy x. 38, is merely the form of an oath: so the 'solenne *carmen* precationis, quod præfari, priusquam populum adloquantur, magistratus solent,' Livy xxxix. 15, is a customary form of words, but not in verse.

But, in the next place, nothing but the optical delusion of a favourite theory could lead any person to discover the traces of metre in this fragment of a legal formula. If the division of a passage of prose into short lines, marked with accents, is sufficient to constitute verse, it would be easy to discover traces of versification in every page of the Digest, to prove that Magna Charta is a poem, and to reduce the Bill of Rights or the Proclamation against Vice and Immorality into a metrical form. Certainly, such liberal canons of Saturnian metre as have been recently laid down would enable any one to transmute into verse the remaining fragments of the Twelve Tables, which Cicero says that the Roman boys in his time learnt by heart, as a 'carmen necessarium.'(127)

Another example adduced is the Delphic oracle, said to have been brought back by envoys from Greece, during the siege of Veii. This passage, which has all the appearance of being a literal prose version from the Greek hexameters of the Pythian priestess, is considered by Niebuhr to contain fragments of Saturnian verses, which he arranges in order;(128) but which have no more the appearance of metre than the legal formula for the trial of Horatius.

Niebuhr again believes that the inscriptions on the tombs

The word is used in the same sense by Cicero, in his speech pro Murenâ, c. 12. In another oration he applies the same word, in the same sense, to the very legal formula which Niebuhr has attempted to versify: 'Namque hæc tua, quæ te hominem clementem popularemque delectant, *I lictor, colliga manus*, non modo hujus libertatis mansuetudinisque non sunt, sed ne Romuli quidem, aut Numæ Pompilii: Tarquinii, superbissimi atque crudelissimi regis, ista sunt cruciatus *carmina;* quæ tu, homo lenis ac popularis, libentissime commemoras; *caput obnubito, arbori infelici suspendito.*' Pro Rabir. perduell. 4. The form of words, recited in Livy, by which the Decii devoted themselves to death, is called a 'carmen,' by Pliny, N. H. xxviii. 3. Again Pliny the Younger, addressing the Emperor Trajan, says, of his condescending to perform the duties of a consul: 'Perpessus es longum illud *carmen* comitiorum, nec jam irridendam moram;' Paneg. 63, where a tedious form of proceedings is signified. The formula 'ne quid respublica detrimenti caperet' is called a 'versiculus' in Cic. pro Mil. 26.

(127) Leg. ii. 23. The word 'carmen' ought to be here understood in the sense explained in the last note.

(128) Livy, v. 16. See Niebuhr, vol. ii. p. 476. n. 1018. He says that the prayer of Valerius, in Livy, vii. 26, is rhythmical, and he prints it with accents, but he does not venture to call it metrical, or to reduce it into Saturnian verse. Hist. vol. iii. note 147.

The Latin version of the commemorative inscription, set up by Pyrrhus of the Scipios are in Saturnian metre, and are repetitions of *næniæ* sung at their funerals.(129) Considering how imperfect our knowledge of the Saturnian metre is, the evidence of their metrical character is very imperfect; but even if it should be thought that these plain and prosaic inscriptions are written in verse, this fact would prove nothing more than the existence of similar inscriptions in elegiac verses, after the Greek metres had been introduced.(130)

The characteristic peculiarity of a poem is, as we have already seen, that it is in verse. Hence the contents of a poem may be true; a composition in verse may be historical as well as fictitious. A poem may be written by a contemporary, for the purpose of celebrating real events, and may thus possess, to a great extent, the character of a history. The Persians of Æschylus is as much a historical drama as Shakspeare's Richard the Third:—though the spectre of Darius is introduced into the one, and the ghosts of Richard's victims in the other. The Capture of Miletus, by the tragic poet Phrynichus, contained so true a portraiture of the sufferings inflicted on the Milesians by their Persian conquerors, that the Athenians fined him for the pain which he had caused them in unlocking their sources of grief for their kinsmen in Asia Minor.(131) In like manner, the poem of Nævius on the First Punic War, and the Annales of Ennius, were historical in their character; not less than the poems of Lucan(132) and Silius on the Civil wars of Rome,

---

at Tarentum, which is quoted by Orosius, iv. 1, is considered by Niebuhr to consist of two Saturnian verses (Hist. vol. iii. n. 841); but they appear rather to be two rude hexameters, into which form they can be reduced by the omission of the word *antehac:*

> Qui invicti fuvere viri, pater optime Olympi,
> Hos ego in pugnâ vici, victusque sum ab isdem.

If we suppose that a part only of the Latin version is given by Orosius, the words 'qui antehac' may have stood at the end of the previous line. Lautius, on the passage of Orosius, supposes the verses to be by Ennius.

(129) Hist. vol. i. p. 257. See Corssen, ib. p. 104—108; Egger, p. 100, 104, 134; Bernhardy, p. 168; Klotz, p. 311.

(130) See note B. at the end of the chapter.

(131) Herod. vi. 21. The defeat of the Persians was also treated by Phrynichus in his Phœnissæ.

(132) On account of his historical character, some of the ancient critics disputed Lucan's right to be called a poet. See Martial, xiv. 194.

and on the war with Hannibal. Such compositions may be compared, so far as their matter is concerned, with Addison's Campaign(133) (which Warton called a Gazette in rhyme) and Scott's poem on the Battle of Waterloo: but the most celebrated modern examples of this class of poetry are the historical plays of Shakspeare, which never deviate widely from the version of English history received in his day.

It is conceivable therefore that poems professing to recount historical events might be substantially true, and might furnish a solid foundation for a prose narrative. Niebuhr however supposes that the poems from which the early Roman history was partly derived, were composed long after the time to which they related, and that the events which they described were in general fictitious. Now this hypothesis solves that part of the problem of Roman history which it is easy to explain, but leaves unsolved that part which it is hard to explain. It is easy to explain how fiction should have been extensively introduced into a historical narrative which was not recorded by contemporaries, which was collected almost exclusively from oral traditions, and which was in great measure not reduced into writing (so far as we can ascertain) until some centuries after the supposed events had occurred. Whatever we may conjecture to have been the sources from which, in the sixth century of the city, three centuries after the commencement of the Republic, Fabius

---

(133) The following verses, which form the conclusion of Addison's Campaign, point distinctly to the historical character of the account of Marlborough's exploits in this poem:

> 'Thus would I fain Britannia's wars rehearse,
> In the smooth records of a faithful verse,
> That, if such numbers can o'er time prevail,
> May tell posterity the wondrous tale.
> When actions, unadorn'd, are faint and weak,
> Cities and countries must be taught to speak;
> Gods may descend in factions from the skies,
> And rivers from their oozy beds arise;
> Fiction may deck the truth with spurious rays,
> And round the hero cast a borrowed blaze:
> Marlborough's exploits appear divinely bright,
> And proudly shine in their own native light:
> Rais'd of themselves, their genuine charms they boast,
> And those who paint them truest, praise them most.'

Pictor, Cincius, and Cato drew up their accounts of the origin of Rome, and of the reigns of the seven kings, we have no difficulty in explaining the fictitious character of the events of that early period, provided we consider them fictitious. Whether we assume a basis of traditionary ballad poetry, or of stories preserved without any fixed metrical form by oral repetition, it is easy to account for the unhistorical character of a narrative formed under circumstances so unfavourable to truth, and resting upon so fluctuating and unstable a foundation.

But the characteristic peculiarity of the early Roman history is that marvellous, romantic, and poetical incidents are intermixed with dry constitutional, legal, and statistical accounts; that stories which bear all the appearance of fiction, which violate all the canons of internal probability, and which are quite consistent with the hypothesis of a poetical origin, are preceded, accompanied, and followed by narrations which have all the air of truth, which observe all the laws of historical probability, which present nothing picturesque, or touching, or attractive to the imagination; and which, if we are to suppose them fictitious, would seem to have been written by a Roman Defoe; by some ingenious author who composed fiction with the deliberate purpose of making it pass for reality. Thus, if we take the reign of Servius Tullius, which is placed in the years 578 to 535 B.C., and is about contemporaneous with the early part of the despotism of Pisistratus—we shall find that the life of this king begins with a marvel and ends with a tragic crime; both of which are suitable to poetry, even if they did not originate in poems. Nevertheless, between these two extremes is intercalated an account of the distribution of the Roman people into classes, for the purposes of the census, which has all the minuteness of a schedule to a revenue Act of Parliament, and is about as poetical.(134)

The reign of Ancus Marcius is, according to Niebuhr, a purely prosaic period, interposed between two epic poems; one of which included the reign of Tullus Hostilius, while the other, beginning with Tarquinius Priscus, related the events of the history down to the battle of Regillus.(135)

---

(134) See below, ch. xi. § 27.

Thus, too, the outline of the narrative of the siege of Veii is considered by Niebuhr, as derived from a poem; but he thinks that the defeat of the tribunes, Virginius and Sergius, described by Livy, is a historical episode in the midst of the poetical fiction.(136) Indeed, according to Niebuhr's view, the whole of the early Roman history is a compound of truth and fiction: it is a tesselated pavement, in which the fancy of poetry alternates with the facts of prose. Now the ballad theory of Niebuhr explains the origin of the fictitious, but leaves unexplained the origin of the historical portion of the narrative; and as there is no apparent origin for an authentic narrative of events in the early ages of Rome, his theory fails at the exact point where the difficulty begins. The hypothesis of funeral orations, and family memoirs, to which Niebuhr sometimes has recourse,(137) and on which Beaufort principally relies,(138) has indeed the advantage of affording an explanation of the mixed character of the narrative, and of accounting for the juxtaposition of fables and facts. Unfortunately, however, all proof of the existence of such prose compositions, not less than of epic poems and ballads, at an early period, is wanting.

Much of the early history consists of accounts relative to the origin of the civil and religious institutions of Rome: and this portion is so considerable that Rubino (as we have already seen) considers it as standing on a higher ground of credibility than the accounts of the exploits and adventures of particular persons. Whatever may be the ground for this distinction, it is at least certain that the ballad theory does not account for the growth of the legal and constitutional part of the early history.(139)

---

(135) See above, p. 212. (136) Above, p. 213.

(137) Above, § 2 and 3. (138) Essai, part i. c. 9.

(139) This is pointed out by Bernhardy, ib. p. 170. The theory of Niebuhr respecting the derivation of the early Roman history from ballads or epic lays is also examined and refuted by Schwegler; vol. i. p. 58—63. His principal arguments are: 1, that the conditions of an early national

There is another circumstance which shows the futility of Niebuhr's ballad-theory, as a historical hypothesis. He divides the early Roman history into three periods:—1. The purely mythical period, including the foundation of the city and the reigns of the first two kings. 2. The mythico-historical period, including the reigns of the last five kings, and the first fourteen years of the Republic. 3. The historical period, beginning with the first secession. The poems, however, which he supposes to have served as the origin of the received history, are not peculiar to any one of these periods; they equally appear in the reigns of Romulus and Numa, in the time of the Tarquins, and in the narratives of Coriolanus, and of the siege of Veii. If the history of periods so widely different was equally drawn from a poetical source, it is clear that the poems must have arisen under wholly dissimilar circumstances, and that they can afford no sure foundation for any historical inference.

For solving the problem of the early Roman history, the great desideratum is, to obtain some means of separating the truth from the fiction; and, if any parts be true, of explaining how those events were recorded, and how the records were preserved with fidelity, until the time of the earliest historians, by whom they were adopted, and who, through certain intermediate stages, have transmitted them to us.

For example, we may believe that the expulsion of the Tarquins, the creation of a dictator, and of tribunes, the adventures of Coriolanus, the Decemvirate, the expedition of the Fabii and the battle of the Cremera, the siege of Veii, the capture of Rome by the Gauls, and the disaster of Caudium

---

epic poetry were wanting among the Romans; 2, that the early history bears no mark of proceeding from plebeian poets, whose songs were animated by an antipatrician spirit; 3, that these poems, if they had ever existed, would not have entirely disappeared; 4, that the early Roman history has not the character of free poetical invention, but is composed in great part of ætiological legends, of stories laboriously invented in order to explain existing names, institutions, customs, rites, and monuments. Schwegler lays it down that so far as the early Roman history does not consist of ætiological legends, it is the deliberate fabrication of historians, or formed of legal and constitutional traditions.

with other portions of the Samnite wars, are events which are indeed to a considerable extent distorted, obscured, and corrupted by fiction, and incrusted with legendary additions; but that they nevertheless contain a nucleus of fact, in varying degrees: if so, we should wish to know how far the fact extends and where the fiction begins—and also what were the means by which a genuine historical tradition of events, as they really happened, was perpetuated. This is the question to which an answer is desired; and therefore we are not assisted by a theory which explains how that part of the narrative which is not historical, originated.

These general reflections would lead us to the conclusion that, with reference to the question of historical evidence, the ballad-theory of Niebuhr is immaterial; inasmuch as poems may be historical as well as fictitious, and the hypothesis of fictitious poems does not assist us in discriminating between fact and fancy in the mythico-historical period of Rome. Before however we leave this part of the subject, it is necessary that we should inquire how far the hypothesis of an early Roman literature, anterior to the age of Nævius and Ennius, is reconcilable with the facts which are known to us from authentic testimony.

The poetry of Rome, as of Greece, preceded its prose; but everything conspires to show that the native poems were rude, unimportant, and devoid of poetical excellence; and that Latin poetry owed its first growth, in a form worthy of the name, to Grecian influence. Livius Andronicus, who, in 240 B.C., the year next after the end of the First Punic War, represented a dramatic poem at Rome for the first time, was a native of Tarentum, a semi-Greek;(140) and he afterwards composed a translation of the Odyssey in Latin verse. Both this work and his plays are described by Cicero as being so antique in their form, as not to be worthy of a second perusal.(141) After Livius came Nævius, who appears to have been a Campanian; his flourishing period was about five years afterwards, and he died in 201 B.C. Nævius wrote his poem on the First Punic War in Saturnian metre; and his works seem in general to have aimed at an exclusively native character but Ennius, whose lifetime extended from 239 to 169 B.C., was born at Rudiæ, in Calabria, and was, like Livius, half a Greek.(142) He banished the primitive intractable Saturnian metre, and introduced the hexameter measure of Greek epic poetry:(143) he instructed the Romans in the Greek language;(144) and he even translated into Latin the sceptical and rationalist work of Euhemerus concerning the gods.

---

(140) See Bernhardy R. L. p. 183. Niebuhr, Lect. vol. ii. p. 203. Suet. de ill. Gramm. i.

On the early knowledge of Greek literature and language among the Romans, see Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 506; vol. iii. p. 310.

Pacuvius, who was born twenty years after Ennius, was, like him, an imitator of the Greek tragedy;(145) Cæcilius, who adapted the later Greek comedy to Roman life, died in 168 B.C., one year after Ennius;(146) and Plautus only survived Ennius fifteen years.(147) The Greek character of his comedy, as well as of that of Terence, who was about a quarter of a century later, is well-known.(148)

---

(141) Cic. Brut. 18. An expiatory poem sung in procession by twenty-seven virgins, in long robes, in 207 B.C., the composition of this poet, is called by Livy, 'carmen, illà tempestate forsitan laudabile rudibus ingeniis, nunc abhorrens et inconditum si referatur.' xxvii. 37. Compare Festus, in Scribas, p. 333.

(142) See Bernhardy, ib. 188, 360.

(143) Above, p. 54. On the Greek character of the works of Ennius, see Niebuhr, Lect. vol. ii. p. 306.

(144) See Enn. Ann. Fragm. p. 143, ed. Spangenberg. Compare Lucret. i. 118.

Ennius ut noster cecinit, qui *primus* amœno
Detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,
Per gentes Italas hominum quæ clara clueret.

(145) Concerning Pacuvius, see Bernhardy, ib. p. 190, 366. Pacuvius was born in 219 B.C., and was alive in 139 B.C.

(146) Concerning Cæcilius Statius, see Bernhardy, p. 391.

(147) Plautus died in 184 B.C. Concerning his relation to the Greek comic drama, see Bernhardy, p. 384: Niebuhr, Lect. vol. ii. p. 204.

(148) Terence was born in 195 and died in 159 B.C., in the 35th year of his age.

Horace commends the boldness of the dramatic poets of his country, in venturing to depart from the Greek models, and to celebrate national subjects:

This brief statement is sufficient to show that the early poetical literature of Rome was, with the exception of the Saturnian poem of Nævius, as much copied from Grecian models as the Eclogues, Georgics, and Æneid of Virgil, or the Odes of Horace. Hence the Second Punic War is pointed out by Porcius Licinius, an early contemporary of Cicero,(149) as the epoch of the introduction of poetry into Rome.(150)

It is clear that Cicero and his contemporaries, in the last century of the Republic, (such as the poet Lucretius), knew nothing of any native historical poetry anterior to Nævius and

---

Nil intentatum nostri liquere poetæ;
Nec minimum meruere decus, vestigia Græca
Ausi deserere, et celebrare domestica facta,
Vel qui prætextas, vel qui docuere togatas.
Art. Poet. 285—8.

Concerning the *tragœdiæ prætextatæ*, which were tragedies on subjects of native Roman history, see Bernhardy, Röm. Litt. p. 343, 347. Their number was small; the most remarkable were the *Romulus* of Nævius; the *Brutus* and the *Decius sive Æneadæ* of Attius; and the *Paulus* of Pacuvius. The extant *Octavia* of Seneca may serve as an example of this species of tragedy. The *fabula togata* was an adaptation of the Greek comedy to Roman subjects: ib. p. 375. Afranius, later than Terence, was the chief master of this style. ib. p. 388.

Bernhardy, ib. p. 350, says that the Roman was framed upon the model of the Greek tragedy, without any attempt at originality. Hence the Roman tragedy was for a long time a mere translation or transfer from the Greek: but at the same time it was a free paraphrase; and thus the Roman tragedy, though not an independent creation, acquired a national character under the treatment of Roman poets.

(149) See Bernhardy, p. 204.

(150) Pœnico bello secundo musa pinnato gradu
Intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram:
Ap. Gell. xvii. 21;

in which verses the antithesis between the cultivation of letters and the military habits of the Romans is marked. Compare Horat. Ep. ii. i. 161-3:

'Serus enim Græcis admovit acumina chartis,
Et post Punica bella, *quietus*, quærere cœpit
Quid Sophocles et Thespis et Æschylus utile ferrent.'

In the same Epistle Horace contrasts the business-like habits of the ancient Romans with the modern love of poetry. v. 103—10. He likewise speaks of the Greeks as devoting themselves to the pursuit of the fine arts, when their wars were at an end. ib. v. 93-8. In early times, poetry was despised and discouraged at Rome: it was considered effeminate and unsuited to the military habits of the nation. Cato, in his work 'De Moribus,' thus described the Romans before his time—'Poeticæ artis honos non erat: si qui in eâ re studebat aut sese ad convivia applicabat, grassator vocabatur.' Ap. Gell. xi. 2. Compare Cic. Tusc. i. 2. Above, p. 165, n. 78.

Ennius;(151) and it may be inferred with probability that Cato, who was coeval with Ennius, and was less than half a century later than Nævius, was equally ignorant of the existence of such memorials of ancient Rome.

It is undoubtedly true that Cicero and the great writers of the Augustan age, laid much stress upon the imitation of Greek models, and preferred—apparently with ample reason—those Roman works, both in poetry and prose, which had departed from the old native style, and were formed after the Greek types. Nevertheless, the admiration of the Greek writers seems to have been introduced slowly, and with difficulty, and by the influence of a few authoritative writers. The general feeling, which partook of a patriotic spirit, was at first in favour of the old native style, and it only yielded to the undeniable superiority of the works fashioned upon foreign models. Cicero occupies a considerable space, at the beginning of his Treatise de Finibus, in the reprehension of those who despise and neglect the early Roman literature, as being inferior to the Greek;(152) while Horace, on the other hand, devotes one of his longest and most elaborate epistles to a refutation of those who admire nothing but the ancient Roman writers.(153) The views of Horace may have prevailed; but at a later period a reaction of taste took place against the modern school of writers; a reaction which caused certain antiquaries to prefer Ennius to Virgil, Cato to Cicero, and Cœlius Antipater to Sallust.(154)

If it is supposed that the early historical ballads of Rome were never committed to writing, but merely floated in oral tradition, and were lost and forgotten, before the Second Punic War, they cannot have formed part of the materials from which

---

(151) See the introduction to the fourth Tusculan Disputation; the account of the origin of Roman literature there given, proves conclusively that Cicero had never read or heard of such poems. Niebuhr conjectures that Nævius imitated his poem on the First Punic War from earlier historical poems in Saturnian verse. Lect. vol. 1, p. xxiii.

(152) i. 1-4.

(153) Ep. ii. 1. Concerning this antique taste, see Bernhardy, p. 238, 242.

(154) Spartian. Hadr. 16. Compare Bernhardy, p. 282-4, 269, 666.

Fabius Pictor and Cincius drew up their history of the early period. If, on the other hand, it is assumed that they were rescued from oral tradition, and were fixed in writing before this time, they would probably have become known to Cato and to some of the early prose writers; and would have been mentioned by them; so that their memory would have been preserved from oblivion; though, like most of the other works of the early Latin literature, they might have perished under the empire. Niebuhr supposes that these poems were suppressed by Ennius, out of envy:(155) a supposition which assumes that they had been reduced to writing before his time: but for this conjecture there is not a tittle of evidence;(156) nor can we understand how Cato, who was born only five years after Ennius,(157) should have been ignorant of a class of literature in which he, as an antiquarian, ought to have taken peculiar interest. In order to support Niebuhr's conjecture, we must suppose that Ennius, a foreigner, brought to Rome under the patronage of Cato, should have been able, not only to suppress a large class of native historical poems, but should have been even able to conceal all knowledge of them from his friend and patron, and should have abolished their very memory: suppositions in the highest degree improbable.

The general result of this examination of Niebuhr's theory respecting the derivation of the early Roman history from ballad or epic poetry, is that it is unsupported by evidence sufficient to prove its truth; and, moreover, that even if it were proved, it would afford little or no assistance for solving the most difficult and important problem of this history. That there were poems, of some sort, composed in the Latin language, before the time of Livius, Nævius, and Ennius, cannot be doubted: the prohibition of defamatory verses, in the laws of the Twelve Tables, is an undoubted proof of the practice of the poetic art among the Romans in the year 450 B.C., at the beginning of the fourth century of the city.(158) But all positive evidence and all arguments from analogy and probability conspire to prove that the Latin language at this time was in a rude, uncultivated state, unsuited to poetical treatment; that the old native Saturnian metre—which Horace stigmatizes as unfit for the contact of civilized life(159)—was rough, inharmonious, and scarcely distinguishable from prose(160)—and that the early Romans, however poetical may have been the ideas in which they conceived their ancient annals, and the exploits of their forefathers, were principally occupied with military pursuits, and bestowed little thought upon poetry or the fine arts.

---

(155) Hist. vol. i. p. 260. He promises to speak elsewhere of the destruction of this poetry; but he never returns to the subject.

(156) See Corssen, ib. p. 164, § 99; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 61.

(157) Ennius was born in 239, Cato in 234 B.C.

The hypothesis of Niebuhr was novel and specious; it was proposed with confidence, and supported with great learning and ingenuity. Hence, like the Wolfian hypothesis respecting the Homeric poems, it met, at first, with a favourable reception, and obtained a qualified, if not an absolute assent from many competent judges. A closer and more deliberate scrutiny must pronounce it to be untenable; but, like the theories of the alchemists, it may, without being true itself, have promoted the cause of truth, by affording a motive for the prosecution of researches which otherwise would not have been made; and, at all events, we owe to it the admirable lays of Macaulay upon the early Roman history, whose excellence does not depend on the truth of any historical hypothesis, and which will still be read with delight, even if we suppose that the imaginary poems of which he appears as the restorer never in fact existed.

---

(158) Dirksen, Zwölf-Tafel Frag. p. 507.

The Twelve Tables denounced the pain of death to any one who libelled or lampooned any one in verse; 'Si quis occentavisset, sive carmen condidisset, quod infamiam faceret flagitiumve alteri.' This prohibition was understood to refer to the stage, though the drama had not been introduced into Rome at the time of the decemviral legislation. See Cic. Rep. iv. 10, and the other passages in Dirksen's Zwölf-Tafel Gesetze, p. 507-516; Rein, Criminalrecht der Römer, p. 357.

The prohibitions in the Twelve Tables against a person 'qui fruges excantasset,' or 'qui malum carmen incantasset,' appear to refer to magical incantations, not to poems properly so called. See Dirksen, ib. p. 539, 619. *Incantare* corresponds to ἐπᾴδειν; see Horat. Sat. i. 8, ad fin. *Carmen* likewise meant a charm, or magical formula, without reference to metre. See Ovid, Met. vii. 167; viii. 455; ix. 300.

(159) He speaks of the *grave virus* of the Saturnian metre as expelled by the *munditiæ* of the refined Greek metres.

(160) See Bernhardy, ib. p. 167.

The lateness of literature at Rome has deprived us, not only of the works which the invention and imagination of the Romans might have produced at an earlier period, but also of the light which they would have shed upon the contemporary state of the people. In Greece, literature is coeval with, and even prior to, authentic history; and by its assistance we can trace the history of the Greek mind, at the same time that we follow the political acts of the Greek states. We have the description of the Persian war, by Herodotus; but we have also the odes of Pindar and the tragedies of Æschylus, who lived at that period. We have the narrative of the Peloponnesian war by Thucydides; but we have also the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides, and the comedies of Aristophanes, who were contemporary with that great contest. The intellectual character of Gorgias, Protagoras, and other rhetoricians and philosophers, who illustrated this age, including even Socrates himself, is represented in the works of Plato and Xenophon. This advantage is wanting in Roman history, until we reach the time of Plautus and Terence; and even their dramas have little originality. Of Nævius and Ennius, there are only fragments; no entire work of Cato is extant, except his uninteresting Treatise on Agriculture. The literature and history of a period mutually illustrate one another. The comedies of Aristophanes throw light upon the history of Thucydides: the history of Thucydides throws light upon the comedies of Aristophanes. Moreover, the undesigned allusions, the casual coincidences of fact, with which contemporary literature abounds, serve to attest the narrative of the historian, and to confirm its veracity. All this illustration, all this confirmatory proof, is wanting to the Roman history during the first four and a-half centuries of the city.(161)

---

(161) See Dr. Arnold's remarks on the disadvantages under which the early Roman history labours, from the want of a contemporary literature: 'A period (he says) of which there remains no contemporary literature, has virtually perished from the memory of after-ages; some scattered bones of the skeleton may be left, but the face, figure, and mind of the living man are lost to us beyond recal.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 82.

NOTE A.—(p. 210.)

FABIUS PICTOR's version of the legend of Romulus and Remus is given at length by Dionysius in i. 79. The passage is printed in Reiske's edition in inverted commas, as if it were a textual citation from Fabius; and Mr. Macaulay is of opinion that it 'has the air of an extract from an ancient chronicle.' (Pref. p. 17.) The same view is taken by several German critics, who are also very competent judges of the point.

It appears to me, however, that the passage is not an extract, but is repeated by Dionysius in his own words; and that he introduces into it certain glosses of his own as he proceeds. The first of these relates to the cave in which the wolf is described as hiding herself, and extends from τὸ μὲν οὖν ἄλσος to ὡς λέγεται, in p. 203, ed. Reiske: 'The wood (he says) is no longer preserved; but the cave from which the spring rises has been surrounded with buildings on the Palatine hill, and *is shown* near the way leading to the Circus. A chapel is near it, where there is a statue commemorative of the event, a she-wolf giving suck to two children, executed in bronze, and of ancient workmanship. The place is said to have been made sacred by the Arcadians under Evander, who colonized it.' This explanatory note must be considered as the insertion of Dionysius himself, and the time referred to is his own time. The same cave, the *Lupercal*, is likewise described above, c. 32, where the reference to his own time is quite distinct and unambiguous. The passage is so understood by Merkel ad Ovid. Fast. p. cxlix., and Becker, vol. i. p. 293, 418, who altogether reject the notion that the words are those of Fabius Pictor.

The second passage is that which principally concerns us at present. It states that Romulus and Remus, as they grew up to manhood, did not resemble common herdsmen, but were worthy of their real royal, and reputed divine origin, as is *even to this day* sung by the Romans in their native songs (p. 204). The time signified by this expression must depend upon the interpretation of the other two passages; for the same time must be meant in all three.

The third passage is in p. 205. After a description of their pastoral life, and of the huts of wood and straw in which they dwelt, the text proceeds thus: 'Of these there remained one *up to my time* on the side of the Palatine hill, looking to the Circus, called the hut of Romulus, which is preserved sacred by its curators, no alteration in it being allowed. Whatever perishes from weather or time is replaced, care being taken to preserve the nearest possible resemblance to the former state.' This passage, like the former one respecting the Lupercal, is understood by Becker, vol. i. p. 401, to refer to the time of Dionysius himself; compare p. 418. Another relic of the regal period, the Sororium Tigillum, is mentioned by Livy as being constantly repaired at the public expense: 'Id hodie quoque publice semper refectum manet.' Livy, i. 26.

There is however considerable difficulty with respect to the locality of the *casa Romuli*, which Dionysius and the Regionary clearly place on the Palatine, while some other authorities seem to refer it to the Capitol. The question is fully discussed by Becker, whose solution does not appear to me satisfactory (ib. p. 401, n. 796). He attempts to explain away all the proofs of a *casa Romuli* on the Capitol. Mr. Macaulay adopts a different course: he suggests that in the time of Fabius Pictor it was on the Palatine, but was afterwards removed to the Capitol. This supposition however can scarcely be reconciled with the statement of Plutarch that Romulus lived *παρὰ τοὺς λεγομένους βαθμοὺς καλῆς ἀκτῆς*; which, he adds, are near the descent to the Great Circus from the Palatine hill. Rom. c. 20. Now these words evidently describe the same spot as that designated by Dionysius, and it is not likely that Plutarch should have been so minute in his specification of the locality if he had not referred to an extant relic of antiquity. Mr. Macaulay, indeed, supposes that the place retained the name, though the hut itself had been removed; but this hypothesis is improbable, although Solinus, i. 18, certainly speaks of a 'tugurium Faustuli,' on the Palatine, where Romulus dwelt, as being no longer in existence. The 'tugurium Faustuli' on the Palatine is likewise mentioned in a fragment of Dio Cassius, vol. i. p. 6, ed. Bekker, but it does not seem clear that the 'hut of Faustulus' and 'the hut of Romulus' are identical. The Romans are described as building *καλιάδες ἱεραί*, in Plut. Num. 8.

Preller, in his edition of the Regionary (Die Regionen der Staat Rom., Jena, 1846), p. 180, prefers the conjecture that there were two huts of Romulus, one on the Palatine, the other on the Capitol, near the temple of Jupiter; the former being alluded to by Dionysius and Plutarch, and named by the Regionary in the region of the Palatium (ib. p. 16); the latter being alluded to by Virgil, Æn. viii. 656: by Macrob. Sat. i. 15, § 10; M. Seneca, Controv. 6 and 9; Martial, viii. 80; and Vitruv. ii. 1. The meaning of the latter passage seems not to be altered by restoring the word *et*, as proposed by Becker, vol. i. p. 402. With this insertion the passage stands thus: 'Item in Capitolio commonefacere potest et significare mores vetustatis Romuli casa, et in arce sacrorum, stramentis tecta.' The latter words are to be rendered: 'The hut of Romulus, even in the sacred citadel, covered with straw.' The expression *arx sacrorum* is, as Becker says, peculiar, but not inadmissible, considering the sanctity of its temples and holy places.

An *ædes Romuli* is named in the fragment of the Sacra Argeorum in Varro, L.L. v. § 54, in connexion with the place called Germalus or Cermalus, which was the side of the Palatine looking towards the Capitol and the river. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 417. It is possible that this building may have inclosed the *casa Romuli* on the Palatine.

Mr. Macaulay and Becker point out the improbability of the existence of two buildings in Rome, each bearing the name of *casa Romuli*. Mr. Macaulay argues that when Dio Cassius mentions on two occasions that the hut of Romulus was burnt (xlviii. 43; liv. 29) he would, if there had been two such huts, have told us of which he spoke. Dio Cassius would undoubtedly have written with greater precision if he had specified the *casa Romuli* to which he referred; but it seems conceivable that two rude huts may have existed, even in the same city. If they had been genuine remains of antiquity, their existence in duplicate would be surprising; but as they were fabricated relics, the occurrence of two rival huts is not more remarkable than the occurrence of several tombs of Æneas in antiquity, or of several relics of a saint in modern times. Æneas, as Dionysius truly remarks, could only be buried in one place; though many tombs, both of him and of other heroes, were shown. (*εἰ δέ τινας ταράττοι τὸ πολλαχῇ λέγεσθαί τε καὶ δείκνυσθαι τάφους Αἰνείου, ἀμηχάνου ὄντος ἐν πλείοσι τὸν αὐτὸν τεθάφθαι χωρίοις, ἐνθυμηθέντες ὅτι κοινόν ἐστιν ἐπὶ πολλῶν τοῦτό γε τὸ ἄπορον, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν μὲν ἐπιφανεῖς τὰς τύχας ἐχόντων*, &c., i. 54.) In like manner, a saint could only have one head, and a martyr could only have suffered by one instrument of execution: nevertheless such relics are multiplied in order to satisfy the curiosity of devout persons. 'Spain (says Mr. Ford) is still the land of relics: for bones and other fragments have escaped better than their precious settings, which the irreverent spoiler removed. In case any traveller may miss seeing any particular *relicario*, he has the satisfactory reflection that there will be found a bit of almost any given article in every other grand repository of the Peninsula: for in proportion as objects were rare, nay unique, they possessed a marvellous power of self-reproduction, for the comfort and consolation of true believers.' Handbook for Travellers in Spain, vol. i. p. 126.

Other cases of duplicate relics have been preserved from antiquity. Thus there were two towns in Cappadocia not far from each other, both of which bore the name of Comana. Both of them claimed a connexion with the Tauric temple of Diana, celebrated for its human sacrifices. Both of them showed the same relics, and especially the sacrificial knife of Iphigenia. Dio Cassius, xxxv. 11. In this instance, the vicinity of the other town did not prevent each Comana from showing this precious relic. (On the connexion of the legend of Orestes and Iphigenia with Comana, see Procop., Bell. Pers. i. 17.) The double relic at Rome was not however an absurdity, for it was conceivable that Romulus might have had two shepherd's huts, and that both might have been preserved.

There was likewise on the Palatine hill an *atrium Caci*, derived from Cacius, who entertained Hercules hospitably, and appears to be a different person from Cacus, the monster and freebooter. (See the Regionary, p. 14, with Preller's note, p. 152, and the passages of Diod. iv. 31, and Solin. i. § 18, there cited; also Becker, vol. i. p. 107.) The cave of Cacus was near the Porta Trigemina, under the Aventine; see Solin. i. § 8; Becker, ib. p. 449. *Atrium* is explained by Preller, p. 119, to be an area surrounded by porticoes or other buildings, those buildings being used as dwellings, for official purposes, for archives, libraries, and the like.

Lastly, it should be observed, with respect to the citation of Dionysius, that there were no inverted commas or other such artifices to mark an extract in an ancient manuscript, and therefore Dionysius, in repeating the words of Fabius, would, in designating the time of that writer, have said *ἕως τῆς Φαβίου ἡλικίας* (or some such words), and not *ἔτι καὶ νῦν, ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἐμέ*, expressions which could not fail to mislead the ancient reader, if the time of Fabius had been intended.

Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 222, understands the words in Dionysius respecting the ancient lays to refer to his own time, and not to the time of Fabius. Ulrici, Bernhardy, and Petersen consider the words to be those of Fabius. Corssen is of the same opinion, ib. p. 99, though he thinks that the verses signified were sacred songs.

Mr. Macaulay likewise rejects the common interpretation of the word *ποίημα* in Plutarch's Life of Romulus, c. 8, extr., and proposes to translate it by *poem*. The following appears to be the meaning of the passage. After having related the birth and nurture of the twins, Plutarch proceeds thus: 'Such being, in the main, the account of Fabius and Diocles of Peparethus (the latter of whom is believed to be the first who published a history of the foundation of Rome), the marvellous and romantic character of the story creates in some minds a suspicion of its truth. But we ought not to disbelieve it, when we remember what great effects are due to fortune, and consider that the Roman power would never have reached such an extent, if instead of having sprung from a divine origin, it had been derived from a mean and ordinary source.'

Plutarch, in his life of Camillus, c. 6, makes a similar remark on the fortune of the Romans, which could not, he thinks, have attained to so great a height, from such base and humble beginnings, without the open and declared exhibition of the divine aid, by means of various supernatural appearances.

The expression *δραματικὸν* in Plutarch may be compared with the language of Livy, v. 21: 'Hæc ad ostentationem *scenæ gaudentis miraculis* aptiora quam ad fidem, neque affirmare neque refellere operæ pretium est.' The ends of history and tragedy are likewise contrasted in Polyb. ii. 56.

Mr. Macaulay admits that none of the translators of Plutarch's Life of Romulus render the word *ποίημα* by *poem*, in the above-cited passage. Leopold, likewise, a late editor of this life, a respectable scholar, translates *ποίημα* by *opus* in this passage in his Index Græcitatis.

NOTE B.—(p. 226.)

No entire poem in the Saturnian metre (unless the epitaph of Nævius upon himself, in four verses, deserves that name; Gell. i. 24) is extant, and therefore our idea of its laws must be principally derived from the accounts of the Latin metrical writers. The normal form which they consistently lay down, and which agrees with the epitaph of Nævius, is that it consists of two members, the first being a dimeter iambic catallectic, the second a dimeter trochaic brachycatallectic, otherwise called an ithyphallic. In less technical language, it may be described, according to the remark of the same grammarians, as consisting either of three iambi with a syllable, and of three trochees, or of a senarian iambic with a syllable. The following verses exemplify this structure:

Dabunt malum Metelli | Nævio poetæ.
Isis pererrat orbem | crinibus profusis.

See Victorinus, iii. 19, p. 190; Plotius, c. 5, § 13, 14, p. 281; Atilius Fortunatianus, i. 8, p. 323; ii. 27, p. 351; Servius, c. 9, § 12, p. 376; Censorinus, c. 2, § 11, p. 407; Diomedes, iii. 34, § 37, p. 495, ed. Gaisford; Terentianus Maurus, p. 243-9, ed. Putsch. The modern writers on the subject are cited by Klotz, ib. p. 280; see particularly the excellent exposition of Grauert, appended to Koene. 'Ueber die Sprache der Römischen Epiker,' Münster, 1840, p. 255—279.

Although the verse above described was the proper type or model of the Saturnian metre, yet the Latin poets seem to have allowed themselves wide deviations from it. Atilius Fortunatianus says: 'Nostri antiqui (ut vere dicam, quod apparet) usi sunt eo non observatâ lege, nec uno genere custodito inter se versûs: sed præterquam quod durissimos fecerunt, etiam alios breviores, alios longiores inseruerunt, *ut vix invenerim apud Nævium quos pro exemplo ponerem.*' p. 323. Fortunatianus proceeds to adduce some abnormal instances of the metre: nearly the same passage recurs in Victorinus, p. 190. Terentianus Maurus gives a similar account:

Sed est origo Græca,
Illique metron istud
Certo modo dederunt;
Nostrique mox poetæ
Rudem sonum secuti
Ut quæque res ferebat,
Sic disparis figuræ
Versus vagos locabant.

See Grauert, p. 268. An asynartete metre, similar to the Saturnian verse, was used by the Greeks, but whether it served as a model to Nævius and the early writers of Saturnian verse, cannot be ascertained. See Hephæstion, de Metris, c. 15, with Dr. Gaisford's note, p. 341-2. A verse of Archilochus, cited by Hephæstion, approaches the Saturnian form:

Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε, | χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον.

(See other verses of the same poet. Frag, 29, ed. Gaisford.)

Grauert remarks that, 'in the Saturnian verse the Romans admitted long instead of short syllables wherever it was convenient. They moreover sometimes allowed the hiatus, sometimes lengthened a short syllable in the arsis, resolved long syllables, and sometimes made a long syllable serve for an entire foot; in short, they indulged in the same licence which appears in Plautus, and, to a less extent, in Terence' (p. 266). The Saturnian metre, in the Punic War of Nævius, and other early poems, was doubtless characterized by its inharmonious lawlessness; and as compared with the model verse above cited, it exhibited the same contrast as that between the verses of Plautus and Terence and those of Aristophanes and Menander. But the metre had a typical form; there was a certain fixed point round which its course, however eccentric, revolved; it was not merely rhythmical, nor did it depend upon accent, without quantity, nor was it satisfied by a mere number of syllables. It is not credible that all the theses, (according to Müller's conjecture) could be omitted, or that such verses were permitted as Niebuhr has made out of Livy's text, the epitaphs of the Scipios, and other prose inscriptions. See Streuber De inscriptionibus quæ ad numerum Saturnium referuntur. Turici, 1845.

A fragment of Charisius, from which Niebuhr had promised new light on the subject, has been published from a Neapolitan MS., by Schneidewin in a program, Gotting. 1841, but it turns out to be so mutilated as to be nearly unintelligible, and to be devoid of value. See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 687; Lect. vol. i. p. 10; Bernhardy, Röm. Litt. p. 167; Streuber, ib. p. 13.

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE TREATMENT OF THE EARLY ROMAN HISTORY BY THE EXTANT HISTORIANS OF ANTIQUITY.

§ 1 WE have in the three preceding chapters attempted to ascertain what were the materials, for the formation of a narrative of early Roman history, at the command of Fabius Pictor, Cincius, and Cato, when they began to write their accounts of that period in the Second Punic War. We have found that there was a continuous list of annual magistrates, more or less complete and authentic, ascending to the commencement of the consular government; that from the burning of the city there was a series of meagre official annals, kept by the chief pontiffs; that many ancient treaties, and texts of laws —including the laws of the Twelve Tables—were preserved; together with notes of ancient usages and rules of customary law —both civil and religious—recorded in the books of the pontiffs, and of some of the civil magistrates; and that these documentary sources of history, which furnished merely the dry skeleton of a narrative, were clothed with flesh and muscle by the addition of various stories handed down from preceding times by oral tradition. Some assistance may have been derived from popular songs, and still more from family memoirs—but there is nothing to show or to make it probable that private families began to record the deeds of their distinguished members, before any chronicler had arisen for the events which interested the commonwealth as a whole.

The essential characteristic of the history of the first four and a-half centuries of Rome—so far as it deserves the name of history, and is a veracious relation of real events—is that it was not reduced into a narrative form by contemporary writers, but that the connected account of it was drawn up at a later period from such fragmentary materials as we have just described. The same was the character of the Grecian history until about the year 500 B.C. Prior to this time there was no contemporary historian: nevertheless some memorials of it were preserved by various means, from which the subsequent writers constructed a continuous narrative.

The early fortunes of the Teutonic tribes before they crossed the Rhine and the Danube, and invaded the Roman empire, are imperfectly known, on account of the want of regular contemporary registration. Some accounts of them have however been recovered from sources similar to those by which the early Roman history was preserved from total oblivion. Such information as has been preserved concerning this dark period is, according to M. Guizot, to be gleaned from the Greek and Roman writers, who notice them incidentally: from documents posterior to the Germanic invasion, such as the Salic, Visigoth, and Burgundian Codes, in which anterior facts are mentioned; and from national recollections and traditions of the Germans themselves.(1) In modern times, we can only find a parallel to this state of things in Oriental countries, where printing is not practised, and the present is not stamped in the indelible characters which preserve its memory in the civilized countries of Europe.(2)

---

(1) Civilisation en France, Leçon 7.

(2) The absence of works bearing the genuine historical character in Hindu literature is confessed by Col. Tod, in the preface to his Annals of Rajast'han. The want of regular histories is, however, he remarks, in some degree compensated by other native memorials, which would afford no despicable materials for the history of India. 'The first of these are the Purans and genealogical legends of the princes, which, obscured as they are by mythological details, allegory, and improbable circumstances, contain many facts that serve as beacons to direct the research of the historian.' The next are the heroic poems. The bards are however court-poets: and there is an understanding between the Prince and the bard, that the recital of the Prince's acts is to tend only to his glory. 'Another species of historical records is found in the accounts given by the Brahmins of the endowments of the temples, their dilapidation and repairs, which furnish occasions for the introduction of historical and chronological details. In the legends respecting places of pilgrimage and religious resort, profane events are blended with superstitious rites and ordinances, local ceremonies and customs.' 'These different records, (adds Col. Tod) works of a mixed

§ 2 Such being then the results at which we must arrive with respect to the sources from which the earliest historians formed their narrative of the events of the first four and a-half centuries of Rome, we have next to inquire whether that narrative was, in its substance, adopted and repeated by Dionysius, Livy, and the other secondary historians of antiquity whose works are now extant.

It has been already shown that Dionysius and Livy wrote their accounts of the first four and a-half centuries with different views and upon different plans.(3) Livy compresses into one book, out of 142, his history of the Foundation of Rome, and of the Seven Kings; whereas Dionysius allots four books out of twenty—a fifth part of his work—to the same period. Dionysius enumerates in detail the writers of the early history, both Greek and native, and he indicates some subsidiary documents from which information respecting the events of that time could be drawn. There is every reason for believing that not only for the general outline of the history, but with respect to each successive event, he took for his groundwork the narrative framed by some one of the historians or antiquarian writers who preceded him; and that the nucleus of his facts was in no case drawn from his own imagination. We may reasonably assume that, in writing his work, he adhered to the pursuit of truth and honesty, which he declared to be his paramount object;(4)

---

historical and geographical character which I know to exist; rasahs or poetical legends of princes, which are common; local puranas, religious comments, and traditionary couplets, with authorities of a less dubious character, namely, inscriptions cut on the rock, coins, copper-plate grants, containing charters of immunities, and expressing many singular features of civil government, constitute no contemptible materials for the historian.' p. xiv.

(3) Above, ch. iii. §. 2.

(4) ἐμοὶ δὲ, ὃς οὐχὶ κολακείας χάριν ἐπὶ ταύτην ἀπέκλινα τὴν πραγματείαν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τοῦ δικαίου προνοούμενος, ὧν δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι πᾶσαν ἱστορίαν, &c. Ant. Rom. i. 6, ad fin. Compare Busse de Dion. Hal. vitâ et ingenio, p. 54. (Berl. 1841, 4to.) Niebuhr says of the history of Dionysius: 'The longer and the more carefully the work is examined, the more must true criticism acknowledge that it is deserving of all respect, and the more will it be found a storehouse of most solid information.'—Lect. vol. 1, p. liv. 'In former times, it was the general belief that whatever Dionysius had more than Livy were mere fancies of his own, but with the exception of

and that he showed that regard for veracity in his own work which he admired in the works of other historians, and prescribed to all. But his notions of historical truth were borrowed from his time and nation; they were such as were current among the later schools of Greek historians and antiquarians. His object was to ennoble and embellish the early Roman history; to rescue it from the annalistic state; to free it from puerile fables and antique marvels; and to invest it with a philosophic dress, such as would give it grace and dignity in the eyes of a cultivated Greek reader. Taking therefore the accounts of the early period of Rome as he found them handed down by previous writers, he subjected them to such a process as he thought best fitted to produce a history worthy of the pen of Thucydides; whom Dionysius, according to the measure of his ability, evidently takes as his principal model, notwithstanding his depreciatory and cavilling criticism of that great writer. For this purpose he reduces all the events to the standard of probability, by omitting or softening down the marvellous, supernatural, and improbable details; and by suggesting other causes and motives more consistent with the real course of human events than those provided or implied by the simple-minded, old-fashioned, and credulous writers who chronicled the traditionary legends. In this procedure, he was fortified by the precedent of Thucydides, who treated the Homeric account of the Trojan war according to the rationalistic method, as well as by the practice of Ephorus, and numerous other Greek writers of the Alexandrian school.(5) With a similar view, he uses every event as a theme to which he may attach some lesson of political wisdom, drawn from the stores of Greek philosophy. This latter object is

---

his speeches there is absolutely nothing that can be called invented: he only worked up those materials which were transmitted to him by other authorities.'—ib. p. lvi. Schwegler expresses the same opinion, vol. i. p. 101. See his account of Dionysius, p. 97-103.

(5) See Becker, vol. i. p. 49, on the method of Dionysius in treating the early history. For an estimate of his work, see Wachsmuth, Aelt. Gesch. des Röm. Staats, p. 44-8.

chiefly effected by the introduction of numerous long didactic speeches, in which the supposed views of the speaker are developed, but which are exclusively the production of the historian himself. There is no reason to suppose that they are founded on any hints or outlines of speeches, contained in the writings of his predecessors; or even that the occasions on which they are represented to have been delivered were mentioned by the earlier historians. The scenes were doubtless dramatized by Dionysius himself, and the speeches were invented with as much freedom of fiction as would be assumed by a dramatic writer.(6) We shall, in future chapters, adduce some examples illustrative of his mode of imagining speeches.(7)

§ 3 Livy's views, in writing the history of his country were, as we have said, different from those of Dionysius.(8) Livy wrote for a Roman, whereas Dionysius wrote for a Greek public: the main object of Dionysius was the early history, the main object of Livy was the later history. Hence the period which occupies the eleven extant books of Dionysius, reaching just beyond the Decemvirate, is in Livy completed in three.

The narrative of Roman history, from the foundation of the city to the expulsion of the kings, and from the expulsion of the kings to the end of the decemviral government, as given by Livy, agrees substantially with that of Dionysius; though it differs widely in most of the details.(9) Both doubtless reproduce the narrative of the events of that period which had been framed by Fabius Pictor, Cincius, and Cato about the time of the Second Punic War; and which the other subsequent historians whom we have already enumerated, posterior to these writers, but prior to Dionysius and Livy, repeated with certain variations and additions.(10) If the works of these historians were now extant, we should be able to dispense with Dionysius and Livy, with respect to the first four and a-half centuries, and we should doubtless be able to form a better judgment than is now attainable, as to the means by which the original narrative of this period was constructed, and the sources from which it was drawn. But our real knowledge of the history of the period would probably be little varied—these writers had themselves no authentic sources of information: though nearer to the time than Dionysius and Livy, they were not near enough to have access to any original testimony: they were neither contemporaries nor the sons of contemporaries; and there is no ground for believing that a Roman under the empire, who could study the works of Fabius, Cato, Piso, Cœlius, and Valerius Antias, would have formed any other or more correct view of the early Roman history than a modern obtains from the perusal of Dionysius and Livy.(11)

---

(6) See Busse, ib. p. 59. The following are Niebuhr's views respecting the speeches in Dionysius: 'We cannot suppose that Dionysius and Livy did anything for the speeches they insert, except work them up as pieces of oratory. Those speeches however are frequently something more, and contain allusions to circumstances of which their narratives show no knowledge, but which cannot possibly have been brought in at random.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 10. 'The careful use which he [Dionysius] made of his authorities, renders him invaluable to us; sometimes even the foundations of his speeches are taken from ancient annalists; many circumstances at least which were mentioned in them, and which he could not incorporate in the body of his history, are introduced in his speeches, which consequently often contain traces of a genuine tradition, though otherwise everything seems to be arbitrary in them.' Lect. vol. 1. p. liv. 'What may be brought against him as a proof of his bad taste are his speeches, in which he imitated Thucydides in such a manner, that he made his heroes speak as if all of them were Athenians, and thus causes them to lose all their individuality of character.' ib. p. lv.

(7) Below, ch. xi. xii. and xiii.

(8) Concerning Livy, see Schwegler, ib. p. 103-115.

---

(9) See Beaufort, Essai, Part ii. ch. 2 and 6.

(10) Lachmann thus describes the existence of an established version of early Roman history before the time of Livy. 'Ubi singulos non citavit plerumque aut consensum historicorum aut vulgarem famam sequitur. De multis, in quibus historici discrepabant, sententia quædam vulgaris invaluerat, mentibus hominum infixa, et in sermonibus, orationibus, etc. memorari solita, aut religionibus confirmata, nec solum de urbis primordiis in tantâ fabularum diversitate, sed in sequenti quoque historiâ. Hanc *vulgatiorem famam* dicit, i. 7, *frequentiorem famam*, ii. 33, (ubi Pisonis narrationi eam præfert, ita xxi. 46, de Scipione *fama* obtinuit. Huic in vetustate rerum standum esse dicit, hæc autem etiam apud historicos aut plures aut nonnullos certe erat, eamque præsertim in primo libro et ubicunque variabatur sequitur, unde sæpe in magnâ narrationum varietate cum Dionysio plane consentit.' De Font. Liv. i. p. 48.

(11) 'One may assume (says Niebuhr) that Livy took every circumstance in his narrative from some one of his predecessors, and never added anything of his own, except the colouring of his style.' Hist. vol. ii. n. 13. If under 'colour of style' we include imaginary speeches, this proposition is deserving of assent: and with a little latitude, it may also be applied to Dionysius, who however embroidered the plain tale of his predecessors more than Livy.

Livy was fully aware of the importance of contemporary historical testimony, and of its superiority to oral tradition:(12) but he took for granted the general truth and authenticity of the narrative of the early history of his country, which had been received for some centuries before his time, and had been repeated by a long series of writers. The critical investigation of primitive history was never carried on with great success by the ancients; and if it had crossed his mind to doubt the events of the early ages of Rome, he would probably have repudiated the idea as so unpatriotic as almost to verge upon impiety. He contented himself with exercising that amount of scepticism, which seems to have exhausted the critical powers of the ancients—even in minds of such gigantic dimensions as those of Thucydides and Aristotle—namely, with trying the received narrative by the canon of internal probability, without inquiring about external testimony. With respect to marvellous incidents, Livy is by no means a credulous historian; the principles laid down in his preface,(13) and his treatment of the mythical period, prove incontestably that he was as little inclined to give credit to events contrary to the order of nature as any educated Roman of his time. When he recounts any supernatural event, which he finds recorded by some of his predecessors, he almost always accompanies it with an expression of unbelief. Like Dionysius, he rationalizes the marvellous incidents by adopting interpretations which reduce them to the level of ordinary nature. Thus both historians mention the explanation of the story of the She-wolf, that it arose from the ambiguity of the word *lupa*, which also signified a woman of unchaste life;(14) an explanation which did not greatly exalt the infancy and education of the founders of the city.

---

(12) See Livy, vi. 1; viii. 40; xxv. 11; xxxix. 14. 'Æquales præcipue scriptores, qui rebus gestis ipsi interfuerant, sectari solebat Livius.' Lachmann de Font. Liv. ii. p. 17. Compare ib. p. 60.

(13) Niebuhr characterizes Livy's preface as follows: 'His preface is very characteristic; *it is one of the worst parts of his work;* whereas the introductions in the great practical historians, Thucydides, Sallust, and Tacitus, are real masterpieces of composition. This may be accounted for by the fact, that Livy began his work, *without being conscious of any definite object;* while the other historians sketched in bold outlines the results of their long meditations.' Lect. vol. 1, p. lx. The short preface prefixed by Livy to his history cannot be fairly compared with the introductions of Thucydides and Tacitus; its object is far more limited and personal than the elaborate discourses to which Niebuhr refers. Viewed in this light, it seems to me a beautiful composition, and well-suited to its purpose. In another place Niebuhr speaks of this preface, as one of 'the most difficult passages in Latin prose'—(Lect. vol. iii. p. 233): but after having often read it with attention, I am unable to perceive the difficulties to which he alludes. Moreover, there seems no ground for believing that Livy began his work 'without being conscious of any definite object.' The only legitimate object which he could have, was to execute what he accomplished, viz.: a detailed account of the affairs of Rome from its foundation to his own time—a period reckoned at 745 years. If his object had been to prove any theory, or to establish any doctrine, he would have undertaken a problem not properly within the province of the historian.

d. 2v. i2

The expressions both of Dionysius and Livy show that this rationalist and lowering explanation of the legend of Romulus and Remus had been promulgated before their time; and indeed there is some ground for thinking that it was known to Cato, whose intimacy with Ennius, the translator of Euhemerus, may have reconciled him with this fashionable mode of treating the heroic legends. Niebuhr supposes that Piso, who lived at the time of the Gracchi, was the first to introduce this system into Roman history:(15) but whether this conjecture is well-founded or not, it is certain that the rationalist method, so well understood by the Greek writers, had been applied to the Roman history before the time of Dionysius and Livy.(16)

---

(14) '*Tenet fama*, quum fluitantem alveum, quo expositi erant pueri, tenuis in sicco aqua destituisset, lupam sitientem ex montibus, qui circa sunt, ad puerilem vagitum cursum flexisse: eam summissas infantibus adeo mitem præbuisse mammas, ut linguâ lambentem pueros magister regii pecoris invenerit. Faustulo fuisse nomen *ferunt*. Ab eo ad stabula Larentiæ uxori educandos latos. *Sunt qui Larentiam vulgato corpore lupam inter pastores vocatam putent: inde locum fabulæ ac miraculo datum.*'—i. 4. Dionysius, having given the marvellous version of the legend of the twins, according to Fabius, proceeds thus: *ἕτεροι δὲ οὐδὲν τῶν μυθωδεστέρων ἀξιοῦντες ἱστορικῇ γραφῇ προσήκειν, τήν γε ἀπόθεσιν τῶν βρεφῶν οὐχ ὡς ἐκελεύθη τοῖς ὑπηρέταις γενομένην, ἀπίθανον εἶναι φασι, καὶ τῆς λυκαίνης τὸ τιθασσὸν, ἣ τοὺς μαστοὺς ἐπεῖχε τοῖς παιδίοις, ὡς δραματικῆς μεστὸν ἀτοπίας διασύρουσιν.* A part of the story substituted by those who treated the other version as unfitted for history, and considered the adventure of the she-wolf as full of theatrical improbability, was that Larentia was called *Lupa* from her unchaste life. *ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο Ἑλληνικόν τε καὶ ἀρχαῖον, ἐπὶ ταῖς μισθαρνούσαις τὰ ἀφροδίσια τιθέμενον, αἳ νῦν εὐπρεπεστέρᾳ κλήσει ἑταῖραι προσαγορεύονται. ἀγνοοῦντας δέ τινας αὐτὸ πλάσαι τὸν περὶ τῆς λυκαίνης μῦθον*, i. 84. The same rationalist explanation is repeated by Plutarch, Rom. 4. In the work De Orig. Gent. Rom. 21, it is attributed to Valerius Antias. It appears to be ancient, for Cato spoke of Larentia as 'meretricio questu locupletata:' Macrob. Sat. i. 10. § 16.

(15) See Hist. vol. i. p. 235-237, vol. ii. p. 9; Lect. vol. 1, p. xxxviii—xl. Compare Krause, p. 139—55.

Niebuhr conceives that Livy has treated the events of the early centuries in an ironical spirit—regarding this period as not really entitled to the character of history.(17) But for this supposition there seems to be no adequate ground. Livy was conscious that contemporary testimony is the only sure historical foundation; and he perceived that the events attributed to the early times were imperfectly known: he ascribed this uncertainty however to the remoteness of time, and not to the absence of coeval registration, which was the real cause. If Thucydides had visited Rome, and if he had investigated its history with as much care as he investigated the history of Athens, he might have left an account of the expulsion of the Tarquins, not less authentic than that which he has left of the overthrow of the Pisistratidæ. In this case, Livy would have had no reason to complain of the obscurity produced by distance of time.(18)

---

(16) Compare the remarks of Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 235. Having repeated Livy's account of the single combat of T. Manlius with the Gaul (vii. 10), Niebuhr proceeds thus: 'This is a faithful copy of Livy's narrative. Here again his poetical mind shows its reverence for the ancient legend, carefully setting forth its poetical features, and not in the least attempting to cut it down to a historical possibility: as had been done two generations previously by the annalist Q. Claudius, whose most vapid narrative Gellius copies with affected admiration' (ix. 13); Hist. vol. iii. p. 77, n. 141. The narrative of this event in Livy is more graphic and minute in its details, but it agrees substantially with that of Claudius Quadrigarius; nor is there any circumstance in Livy which is impossible, or even improbable. The admiration of Gellius, moreover, as well as that of Favorinus, mentioned by him, for the passage in question, appears to have been quite genuine, and not at all affected.

(17) See Hist. vol. ii. p. 459, n. 1011. Speaking of the reign of Romulus, he says: 'Livy tells the tale of these times like a history, *without meaning it to be one;* his poetical feeling enabling him to comprehend these ages better than those in which historical light was beginning to dawn.'—Hist. vol. i. p. 228. Again, in Hist. vol. i. p. 3, it is said of Livy: 'He wrote, without any positive feeling whether of doubt or conviction, bringing down the marvels of the heroic ages into the sphere of history.' The same view recurs in the Lectures: 'He [Livy] treats the whole of the early history with a sort of irony, half believing, half disbelieving it.'—vol. i. p. 270.

(18) In vi. 1, he speaks of the events narrated in his first five books, as 'res quum vetustate nimiâ obscuras, *veluti quæ magno ex intervallo loci vix*

Niebuhr seems to view Livy principally in the light of a great painter; who represents historical scenes in vivid and striking colours.(19) Hence his admiration of the first book, containing the regal period; which he considers the masterpiece of Livy's whole history.(20) Livy undoubtedly possessed much eloquence and power of description: but he manifestly considered the later and not the earlier period of the history as his main object:(21) and the tone which Niebuhr calls ironical is

---

cernuntur, tum quod et raræ per eadem tempora litteræ fuere, una custodia fidelis memoriæ rerum gestarum.' Compare the expressions in i. 3, ii. 4, 21, and iv. 23.

(19) After his criticism of Livy's account of the capture of Rome by the Gauls, Niebuhr proceeds thus: 'It would be extremely unjust to impute what has here been said about Livy's narrative to a design of detracting from his merits. Such criticisms cannot impair his imperishable fame. As soon as we cease to call for what it was Livy's least care to supply, nothing remains to disturb the pleasure which his description must yield to every unprejudiced mind. If there be one so distempered as to forego that pleasure, *because his account has been proved to be historically untenable*, we may pity, but we must not indulge its perverseness. A writer who adopts a dry and neglected report, in preference to a well-known and masterly narrative, must justify himself, and show that it is not from the love of paradox, that he has discarded the more beautiful story. Those of my readers who have followed me thus far with interest, must by this time be sufficiently acquainted with me to believe that I was sincere in the opinion I expressed with regard to Livy in the first pages of this history. *And in his own peculiar excellences, in that richness and that warmth of colouring which many centuries after were the characteristics of the Venetian painters born under the same sky*, he never shone more brilliantly than in this very description: a more vivid one is not to be found in any Latin or Greek historian.' Hist. vol. ii. p. 543. In the same spirit he remarks, in vol. i. p. 5, that 'to vie with Livy as a historian, to fancy that the last portions of his work might be replaced, if our materials were more abundant, would be ridiculous.' In p. 4, he thus characterizes Livy's talent: 'What moved him to write was that nature had endowed him with a brilliant talent for the representation of character, and for narration; with the imagination of a poet, though either without the power or the love of versifying.' In his Lectures, he thus speaks of the account of the aged centurion, in Livy ii. 23. 'Livy's account of the manner in which the tumult spread further and further, and how the Senate at first provoked the people and was afterwards frightened by them, is exquisitely beautiful, and shows a profound knowledge of human nature; but the detail cannot be regarded as an actual tradition, *but is only an historical novel*.'—vol. i. p. 136.

(20) Hist. vol. i. p. 495, n. 1103. Niebuhr says that Livy, guided by his poetical feeling, drew his narrative of the times of the kings mainly from Ennius. Hist. vol. i. p. 346. For this conjecture, however, (which recurs, Lect. vol. i. p. lxi. and 3,) there is no sufficient evidence; nor is it consistent with the general character of the narrative in Livy's first book.

(21) Above, ch. ii. § 9. In his Lectures, vol. 1, p. lxiii. Niebuhr describes Livy as conceiving the period of the free Republic to have been a sort of

rather that of indifference and uncertainty as to the true character of the events, than covert mockery. Livy does not attempt to conceal the discrepancies in the statements of his predecessors respecting many important events in the early history: thus he mentions the various accounts which were

---

golden age, of which he had no distinct idea. But Livy must have understood the time from the Second Punic War to the Civil wars of Cæsar better than any portion of the previous history. Elsewhere Niebuhr says: 'If we possessed the second decad, *which was probably far better than the later ones*, we should see manifest reasons to account for the loss of the latter; for, *as they were so much inferior to the first decads*, they were never read in the schools of the grammarians, and consequently were very seldom or never copied.' Lect. vol. 1, p. lx. If the latter decads were inferior to the early ones, in point of composition, this fact might be as well ascertained now, from a comparison with the first, third, fourth, and the five books of the fifth decad, as it could be by a comparison with the second decad, if it were extant. In fact, however, there seems to be no ground for supposing that the later were inferior, even in point of composition, to the early books. As works of history, they were doubtless far more valuable and authentic. The preservation of the first decad may be accounted for by the attractive nature of the stories of the early times: and that of books xx. to xlv. by the interest which attached to the contest with Hannibal, and the conquest of Spain, Greece, and Asia Minor. Elsewhere however Niebuhr forms a more favourable estimate of that portion of Livy's work, in which he appeared as a contemporary historian. It is indeed difficult to see how the views expressed in the preceding passage, can be reconciled with the following estimate of his history. 'His wish was, to turn away his thoughts from the degeneracy of his own days, while reviving the glories of the past: and the ease and security wherein the weary world was at length beginning to breathe again, could not but comfort him in his sorrow when portraying the fearful events of the civil wars. He was desirous of teaching his countrymen to know and admire the deeds of their ancestors, which had been forgotten, or were recorded only in lisping narratives: and he enriched their literature with a colossal master work, with which the Greeks have nothing of the kind to compare, nor can any modern people place a similar work by its side. Of all the losses that have befallen us in Roman literature, the greatest is that which has left his history imperfect.'—Hist. vol. i. p. 4. If on the one hand it appears an unjust depreciation of Livy, to treat him as a mere rhetorician, and painter of scenes, the best part of whose history is that which is not regarded by him as historical; yet on the other hand the estimate of his work in the preceding passage is unduly high. In what sense can it be said with truth that neither Greece nor modern countries have any history which can be compared with that of Livy? Is it meant that the history of Livy is superior to that of Thucydides? It is to be observed that we possess only 35 out of 142 books of Livy; and some of these are not perfect; so that our estimate must be formed upon only one-fourth of the work; the remaining three-fourths being lost. If the whole work were extant, its bulk would be about four times its present size: it now occupies about three octavo volumes; if it were complete, it would occupy about twelve volumes of the same size. The time comprised in it is 745 years. If it is a 'colossal masterwork' on account of its bulk, there are many modern histories which given of the later years of Coriolanus.(22) In this respect, Dionysius is less candid: he is more careful to cover the seams and cracks of the history, and to conceal its defects—'ut per læve severos Effundat junctura ungues'—than the voluminous Livy.(23) At the same time, while Livy admits the existence of doubts as to particular events of the early period, he was far from indulging in any scepticism with regard to it as a whole; and we may be sure that he considered the accounts of the reigns of Servius Tullius and Tarquinius Superbus to be in the main as well authenticated as the history of the Punic wars. It is true that he had no better voucher for them than writers who lived long after the time, and had no authentic materials from which a detailed narrative could be framed; but provided that a previous historian had produced an account of an event, and that this account involved nothing contrary to the laws of nature and of historical verisimilitude, Livy seems to have been satisfied, and to have asked no further questions. The writers whom he quotes

---

can be compared with it: and the same remark applies to the number of years which it includes. Niebuhr thus describes the manner in which he conceives Livy to have composed his history: 'We must suppose that Livy, like most of the ancient writers, dictated his history to a scribe or secretary, and the manner in which he worked seems to have been this: he had the events of one year read to him, and then dictated his own history of that year, so that he composed the work in portions, each comprising the events of one year, without viewing this year either in its connexion with the preceding or the subsequent one.'—Lect. vol. 1, p. lxi. This description might apply to the period from b. xxi. to xlv.—during which each book usually occupies about two years; but it is inapplicable to the chief part of the first decad, where a book contains several years; and some years are almost uneventful. Neither does it seem applicable to the later books, which must have been founded in great part upon personal knowledge and oral information. With respect to the Second Samnite War, Niebuhr afterwards says: 'Livy had described some parts of it with great pleasure, but others with evident weariness, which was the result of his mode of writing: *he entered on his task without preparation*, whence he wrote with freshness and vigour indeed, but *had neither a clear insight into the history nor a command of his subject*.'—ib. vol. i. p. 351. This account of Livy's mode of writing seems inconsistent with the previous assumption that he caused the events of each year to be read to him before he dictated the history of that year. The latter words seem scarcely consistent with the superiority over all Greek and all modern histories which Niebuhr assigns to Livy's work.

(22) Livy, ii. 40.

(23) See on this subject the remarks of Beaufort, Essai, p. 145.

most frequently, and whom he seems to have chiefly consulted in composing the extant books of his history, are Claudius Quadrigarius, Cœlius Antipater, and Valerius Antias. Of these, the two first lived at the time of the Gracchi; the third is of even later date.

The belief that Livy is a credulous and superstitious writer, appears to have been derived from his detailed enumerations of prodigies, and from his serious and careful manner of treating these events, which in our eyes are destitute of all historical interest and importance. But these prodigies doubtless occupied a prominent place in the official annals of the chief pontiff; and from the care with which they were expiated by ceremonies conducted under the control of the public authorities, we may be sure that they were, at the time, considered of the highest moment. If they had not been duly attended to, and adequately atoned for by proper observances, they would in many cases have left on the minds of the people a religious dread not less than that which ruined the Athenian army at Syracuse. There were standing rules with respect to the expiation of certain prodigies, which prove the awe with which they were regarded by the state, and the strong sense of the necessity which existed for treating them as matters of national concern. It was laid down that whenever stones fell from heaven, there was to be a religious celebration of nine days, appointed by public authority;(24) and likewise, that whenever an ox was reported to have spoken, a sitting of the Senate was to be held in the open air.(25)

If the Greeks had made all prodigies a matter of public concern—if they had been regularly reported to the magistrates, and treated with national expiatory rites, the subject would probably have been noticed from time to time by their later historians. This might have given their works a puerile appearance in the eyes of a modern reader; but if the interference of the state, on such occasions, relieved the minds of the people from depressing fears, which, when left to their natural course, would have been productive of national calamities, the means by which this benefit was effected were deserving of historical commemoration.

---

(24) See Livy, i. 31.

(25) Plin. viii. 45. The importance which the Roman people attached to prodigies, even in the time of Cicero, may be seen from the space which he allots to this subject in his third Catilinarian oration, c. 8, a speech delivered at a moment of terror, in which none but topics of deep interest would be admitted.

§ 4 The speeches in Livy, like those of Dionysius, must be regarded as the original compositions of the historian, not founded on speeches actually delivered. They are evidently viewed in this light by Quintilian, who praises Livy for his extraordinary eloquence, and for putting into the mouths of his speakers those sentiments which are suited to the person and the occasion.(26) This latter praise certainly appears undeserved. The speeches attributed to each person, from the time of the kings to the age of Antiochus and Perseus, are all, in point of style, expression, and argument, such as might have been made by a contemporary of the historian. It has been said of Shakspeare, that he appears like a ventriloquist, who can throw his voice in succession into each of the persons in his drama, and make each speak in his own natural tones. In reading Livy, on the other hand, we have the eloquent historian addressing us, in his own style, in the person of each of the kings, dictators, consuls, tribunes, and ambassadors, who are successively brought on the scene. It is true that this uniformity of style pervades the speeches of Thucydides; and it arises from the same cause—that they are the historian's own composition. Thucydides, however, assures us that he adheres to the substance, though not to the form of the speeches actually delivered;(27) whereas, Livy had in general no means of ascertaining the tenour of the arguments really used. In some of the early books, Livy occasionally uses a form of expression which implies that the substance of the speech existed in a previous history. Such is a speech put in the mouth of Tarquinius Priscus, when he was courting the favour of the people in order to be elected king.(28) Two long speeches, attributed to T. Quinctius Capitolinus and to Appius Claudius Crassus, are likewise introduced with words which appear to imply that something similar existed in previous histories.(29) With respect to the celebrated speech of Menenius Agrippa, containing the apologue of the Belly and Limbs, we have the express testimony of Dionysius, that 'it occurred in all the ancient histories;'(30) whence he and Livy transferred it into their works.

---

(26) Nec indignetur sibi Herodotus æquari T. Livium, cum in narrando miræ jucunditatis, clarissimique candoris, tum in concionibus, supra quam enarrari potest, eloquentem: ita dicuntur omnia, cum rebus, tum personis, accommodata. Quintil. x. 1, § 101. See above, p. 217, n. 6.

(27) i. 22.

Whatever ground there may have been for the ancient report of the speech of Menenius Agrippa, which, being very pointed and striking, might have been preserved by oral tradition longer than an ordinary speech, we may be sure that Fabius and his successors could have had no authentic materials for accounts of speeches during the first five centuries, and therefore that all speeches introduced into their histories at this period, must have been not less imaginary than those which were composed by Livy and Dionysius themselves.(31)

Speeches made to the assemblies of the people at Rome, by the magistrates or tribunes, as well as addresses of generals to the armies, were delivered in the open air, in the rostra, or upon a tribunal of turf, and might be heard by any person who wished to be present. But the sittings of the Senate were always private: strangers were never admitted without special permission.(32) Clerks were indeed present in the Senate, who kept an official record of its proceedings, similar to the Journals of Parliament:(33) and an account of the proceedings, both of the Senate and the popular assembly, was made by the direction of Julius Cæsar, when he was consul, and circulated among the public.(34) But no report of the speeches delivered in the Senate was preserved by the official scribes; nor do we hear of the senators, or magistrates privileged to attend, making any notes of the words spoken, until the time of Cicero.(35)

---

(28) Isque primus et petisse ambitiose regnum, et orationem dicitur habuisse ad conciliandos plebis animos compositam, i. 35. These words are not indeed conclusive.

(29) Of Quinctius he says: 'Ibi in hanc sententiam locutum accipio, iii. 67. The speech is addressed to a *concio* of the people at Rome. The speech of Claudius is described as delivered at the comitia for the election of magistrates: App. Claudius Crassus, nepos decemviri, dicitur odio magis irâque, quam spe, ad dissuadendum processisse, et locutus in hanc fere sententiam esse, vi. 40. Other instances are collected in Lachmann de Font. Liv. i. p. 121.

(30) Dion. Hal. vi. 83. Livy. ii. 32. Below, ch. xii. § 16. By 'ancient histories' Dionysius means the works of Fabius and his successors. Livy calls Fabius 'longe antiquissimus auctor' in reference to the death of Coriolanus. ii. 40.

(31) Concerning the Speeches in Livy, see Lachmann de Font. Liv. i. p. 119-23; ii. p. 114-6; Ulrici Ant. Hist. p. 123.

---

(32) Of the speech of King Eumenes to the Senate in 172 B.C. Livy says: 'Hæc oratio movit patres conscriptos. Cæterum in præsentiâ nihil præterquam fuisse in curiâ regem, scire quisquam potuit: eo silentio clausa curia erat. Bello denique perfecto, quæque dicta ab rege, quæque responsa essent, emanavere.'—xlii. 14. See also xxii. 60; xxxiii. 22. Valerius Maximus says: 'Adeo autem magnâ caritate patriæ omnes tenebantur, ut arcana consilia patrum conscriptorum multis seculis nemo senator enuntiaverit.'—ii. 2, § 1. He proceeds to mention an instance of Fabius Maximus, disclosing to P. Crassus on a journey the decision to begin the Third Punic War, from a mistaken idea that he was a senator. These descriptions refer to the ordinary practice of the Senate, and not to exceptions caused by the importance of the question. See Becker, ii. 2, p. 420; ii. 3, p. 227-8. Compare Polyb. iii. 20. When peculiar secrecy was required, the clerks and public slaves who usually attended the sittings of the Senate, were ordered to withdraw, and the minutes of the proceedings were drawn up by the senators themselves. This was called a *senatus-consultum tacitum*. Capitolin. Gord. 12. See Becker ii. 2, p. 446: ii. 3, p. 228.

(33) See Becker, ii. 2, p. 445-6.

(34) Inito honore, primus omnium instituit ut tam senatûs quam populi acta conficerentur et publicarentur. Sueton. Cæs. 20. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 32.

(35) Cicero thus describes the preparations which he made for obtaining a report of the disclosures before the Senate on the important day on which he produced his evidence against the Catilinarian conspirators, and confronted the witnesses with Lentulus. 'Itaque introductis in senatum indicibus, constitui senatores, qui omnia indicum dicta, interrogata, responsa perscriberent. At quos viros? non solum summâ virtute et fide, cujus generis in senatu facultas maxima; sed etiam quos sciebam memoriâ, scientiâ, consuetudine et celeritate scribendi, facillime quæ dicerentur persequi posse: C. Cosconium, qui tunc erat prætor; M. Messellam, qui tum præturam petebat, P. Nigidium, App. Claudium. Credo esse neminem qui his hominibus ad vere referendum aut fidem putet aut ingenium defuisse.' Pro Sullâ, c. 14. The account in Plut. Cat. Min. 23, is doubted by Becker, ii. 2, p. 446, and appears to be a confusion with the fact described in the passage of Cicero.

The general publicity of all political business was, however, such at Rome, while the free government lasted, that the contemporary writers would after a time have no difficulty in obtaining a substantially correct account of the proceedings in the Senate;(36) and hence we need not doubt that the speeches attributed to Romans in Livy, from the commencement of the Second Punic War—a period during which he had access to the works of contemporary historians—are in general substantially true; but the speeches in Dionysius, and in the first decad of Livy, as to which their predecessors could have obtained no authentic accounts, must be considered as mere rhetorical fictions, similar to the exercitations of the sophists and grammarians upon historical themes. Even for the later books of Livy, the accounts of speeches delivered in the Carthaginian Senate,(37) and in places beyond the reach of Roman testimony, whether composed by him or his predecessors, were probably mere works of the invention,(38) and of no historical value.

---

(36) See the curious passage of Dio Cass. liii. 19, where he contrasts the publicity of the Commonwealth and the consequent facility of ascertaining historical truth with the secrecy and obscurity of the Empire. The Roman government, so long as the Republic lasted, was, according to Dio, altogether free from that system of concealment and mystery which characterized the operations of the Lacedæmonian government, which Thucydides designates as τὸ κρυπτὸν τῆς πολιτείας, v. 68. The quorum of the Roman Senate was, under the Republic, as much as four hundred, according to Dio Cass. liv. 35.

(37) 'The speeches which Livy puts into the mouth of Hanno are rhetorical flourishes taken from Cœlius Antipater, but the character of those of Fabius is historical: it is evident that he was envious, and that he could not bear the star which was rising above him.' Niebuhr, Lect. vol. ii. p. 77. The debate between Fabius Maximus and Scipio, in Livy, xxviii. 40—4, is one of the most interesting recorded in history, and there is no reason to doubt that the general scope and tenour of the arguments on each side is fairly reported. Fabius was probably influenced by jealousy of Scipio; compare xxix. 19, but the policy of carrying the war into Africa was doubtful: it was probably only successful through the extraordinary military talents of Scipio, which had not as yet been fully developed; and although Fabius may on the whole have been wrong, there was great force in the arguments on his side of the question.

(38) It is not easy to understand how foreign ambassadors, and foreign princes, such as Eumenes and Demetrius, who are represented as addressing the Roman Senate, could have made themselves understood. They could not have spoken in Latin, and many of the Roman Senators must have been ignorant of Greek—which performed the functions of French, as the universal language, in antiquity. The probability is that they were accompanied by an interpreter, or by some representative who could speak

Where we have a general confidence in the accuracy and honesty of a historian, we are perfectly justified in believing his report of the accounts of the contemporary writers, although those writings may have perished. There is no extant consecutive history, written by a contemporary, for the times of the Gracchi and Sylla, or for the dominion of Augustus: yet we can with safety trust the general fidelity of the accounts of those periods, which Plutarch, Appian, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and other secondary writers have left us, derived from contemporary chroniclers. But we cannot place faith in the narratives of Dionysius and Livy, with respect to the first four and a-half centuries of Rome, upon similar grounds. The writers from whom they derived their accounts lived at times long posterior to this period. How they formed their narratives we do not know, and can only guess.

Those who, at the time of the Second Punic War, wrote concerning the period of the kings, and the first century of the Republic, had scarcely better means of information than Dionysius and Livy, who wrote about two centuries later, and, as far as direct and personal knowledge was concerned, stood on a par with them. However little conscious the historians of the Augustan age may have been of the uncertainty of the second-hand and traditionary evidence on which their predecessors had founded the received version of the early history, yet we, who judge it by severer canons of evidence, must make a great distinction between the accounts which Livy found for the period

---

in Latin. Cicero indeed distinctly states that foreigners addressed the senate through an interpreter. De Div. ii. 64. Livy describes Æmilius Paullus, when Perseus was brought to him prisoner, in his camp in Thrace, as first addressing Perseus in Greek, and afterwards speaking in Latin to his own companions, xlv. 8: afterwards, Æmilius Paullus, at Amphipolis, announced the decision of the Senate to the Macedonian delegates in Latin: Cn. Octavius the prætor interpreted it to them in Greek: 'Silentio per præconem facto, Paullus Latine quæ senatui, quæ sibi ex consilii sententiâ visa essent pronunciavit; ea Cn. Octavius prætor (nam et ipse aderat) interpretata sermone Græco referebat.' ib. c. 29. This course was probably adopted by Æmilius Paullus, from a notion of dignity: he would not condescend to address the Macedonians in their own language, though (as we see from his interview with Perseus), he could probably have done so, if he had thought fit.

anterior to Pyrrhus and those relating to the subsequent time. Again, when Dionysius cites the testimonies of Fabius, Vennonius, and Cato respecting the tribes of Servius Tullius, but prefers the latter, as being a more credible witness than either of the other two;(39) we must remark that the evidence of Cato, who lived from 234 to 149 B.C., has very little weight with respect to the reign of Servius Tullius, which is placed in 578—35 B.C.: its close being just 300 years before his birth.

Niebuhr assigns to Livy a very limited knowledge of the constitution of his own country. Livy, he says, was a boy when Cæsar crossed the Rubicon: he had no distinct notion of the Republican government; he conceived the Republican period of Rome under the idealized form of a golden age.(40) 'The constitution (says Niebuhr) he altogether neglected, except when forced to speak of it by the internal dissensions.'(41) 'He had no idea of the early Roman constitution: even that which was established in his youth was not very well known to him. That which in the early institutions bore the same name as in his own days, is always confounded by him with what actually existed.'(42) Of Dionysius, as being a foreigner, it is natural that Niebuhr should take a similar view. 'In the history of the constitution (he says) we meet with a peculiar difficulty, from the circumstance that not a few of the most important statements, among those too which are derived from the very highest authorities, sound utterly unmeaning, because the persons who have handed them down to us were quite unable to understand them. Dionysius excogitated the most erroneous representations, which pervert whatever they exhibit; because he never suspected that he wanted the fundamental idea of the constitution, and did not resolve to abandon all attempts at making out the enigma.'(43)

---

(39) See Dion. Hal. iv. 15, as emended by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 973. Whatever reading is adopted, Dionysius prefers some one of these three writers to the other two.

(40) Lect. vol. 1. p. lxiii. (41) Hist. vol. i. p. 4.

(42) Lect. vol. 1. p. lxv. Elsewhere he speaks of Livy 'as displaying the confusion of a man who, with all his genius, is yet in reality only a rhetorician, and proving that he was as little acquainted with the political affairs of Rome as with the regulation of her armies.'—Lect. vol. i. p. 221. In Hist. vol. ii. p. 224. Niebuhr says that when Livy began to write his history, he was a total stranger to the language of the ancient constitutional law.

§ 5 If the accounts of the early constitution which Livy and Dionysius found in the writings of their predecessors, were perspicuous, precise, and authentic, they were inexcusable for their error and ignorance: but as their erroneous view was shared by Cicero, Sallust, Florus, Tacitus, Dio Cassius, Appian, Plutarch, and all the other extant writers on the early history, it seems that the misunderstanding was not peculiar to them, but was common to all those who had any opinion or knowledge on the subject. It is certainly possible that the whole Roman community in the Augustan age may, from the want of accurate and complete information, have agreed in a common error as to the early constitution of their country. Error is not the less error from being participated by a larger number of people. In this case, it would probably appear that the truth is irreparably lost, and that although we may reject the fiction, we can never recover the fact. Niebuhr however holds a different doctrine. He thinks that although 'ingenious and learned men, like Livy and Dionysius, did not comprehend the ancient institutions, yet they have preserved a number of expressions from their predecessors, from which we, with much labour and difficulty, may elicit the truth.'(44) Hence, from certain expressions preserved in the earlier historians, which Livy and Dionysius are held to have misunderstood, Niebuhr undertakes to restore the ancient constitution according to the true meaning of the writers whose words are adduced.(45)

---

(43) Hist. vol. ii. p. 13. Compare the remarks, ib. p. 220—3, concerning his supposed misconception of the early constitution.

(44) Lect. vol. i. p. 83. See the entire passage, cited above, p. 119, n. 83.

(45) Thus he says that Dionysius copied the expressions of the old annals about the clients without understanding them. Hist. vol. i. p. 412, n. 590. He re-translates accurate expressions which Dionysius did not understand, on the confusion of *populus* (as synonymous with the *curiæ*), and δῆμος, ib. p. 608, n. 1343. He says that Livy sometimes confounds *populus* and *plebs;* sometimes copies annals which preserved the distinction: ib. vol. i. p. 427, n. 993; p. 530, n. 1172. In his Lectures, vol. i. p. 121, he refers to two statements in Livy, respecting the combination of the Roman and Latin centuries into maniples (Livy, i. 52, viii. 8);

The opinion of Rubino as to the inadmissibility of this mode of criticism upon the accounts of the early Roman constitution preserved by the classical writers, has been already quoted.(46) We will however remark further, that an attempt to correct the interpretation of a lost passage in an ancient Roman historian, adopted by Livy and Dionysius, when those writers had not only the original passage, with its context, before them, but had read the entire work, together with other similar histories, now equally lost, is an undertaking of extreme difficulty: and moreover, the conditions of the problem are so indeterminate that even if it were correctly solved, we could never know that the solution is correct. But the most important defect in this method of restoring the ancient Roman constitution is that the whole reasoning rests on an assumption that the writers, whose genuine expressions Dionysius and Livy accidentally preserved but wholly misapplied, were themselves competent witnesses on the subject. What guarantee have we that an annalist of the sixth century of the city, writing about events said to have taken place three, four, or five centuries before his own time, and unassisted by any contemporary history, gave a faithful description of any real event, or used language which correctly represented the political state of the people at that remote time? It is impossible for us to take for granted that the very writers whom Livy and Dionysius followed (even if their meaning is correctly guessed by Niebuhr, through the veil which envelopes it,) were correctly informed as to the constitutional history of a time so long previous to their own age.

§ 6 It rarely occurs that we can check the accuracy of the ancient historians, in reporting the effect of public instruments which they cite. It happens however that the contents of the senatus-consultum concerning the Bacchanalia, mentioned by

---

and he proceeds thus: 'the authorities from which he derived his information, contained testimonies quite independent of one another; and he quotes them without understanding them, but in such a manner that we are able to deduce from his statements the correct view of the annalists.' Compare ib. p. v. vi. 83, 158, 221, 270.

(46) Above, p. 116.

Livy in his 39th book, have been preserved in an ancient brazen tablet; and we find that the summary given by him agrees altogether with the inscription.(47) So far as this goes, it serves to inspire confidence in his accuracy.(48)

§ 7 Upon taking a general review of the results at which we have hitherto arrived, it is impossible to say that we have been able to discover any solid or stable foundation for the history of the first four and a-half centuries as it is delivered to us by Dionysius, Livy, and other classical authors. Much of it, indeed, if we confine ourselves to internal evidence, has an historical aspect, particularly for the period after the burning of the city. We have likewise sufficient grounds for believing that a chronological series of the annual magistrates, more or less complete, was preserved for the chief part of the Republic, and that since the Gallic conflagration there was an official annalistic record, in which the principal events of each year were registered. How far this outline was filled up by accounts derived from funeral orations or family records, from popular poetry and from oral traditions; by whom and in what manner these supplementary materials were obtained; and how far they were authentic and trustworthy, are questions which we are unable to solve. Hence it follows that during the first four and a-half centuries, the historical narrative is principally composed of events which we can trace to no determinate source. During this period of time we can scarcely place our finger on any fact, and affirm with reasonable confidence, that it was taken from the Annales Maximi of such a year; that it was derived from the memoirs of such a family, or from the funeral oration on such a man; that it was founded on such a ballad or poem; or on an oral tradition preserved in such a district, in such a college of priests, in such a line of public officers, or in such a family or *gens*.

---

(47) See Livy, xxxix. 18. For the senatus-consultum de Bacchanalibus, see Goettling, Funfzehn Römische Urkunden.

(48) Jacobus Gretserus, De Jure prohibendi Libros hæreticos, Ingolstadt, 1603, 4to, lib. i. c. 30, p. 228, cites S. Antoninus as relating, on the authority of Cardinal Joannes Dominicus, that Gregory the Great burnt all the copies of Livy which he could procure, 'quia ibi multa narrantur de superstitionibus idolorum.' He refers to Antoninus, 4 p. Summ. tit. xi. ca. 4, § 3 in fin., and Joann. Hessel in explic. 2, præc. Decal. c. 73. He then adds: 'Ego de hâc narratione assensum meum suspendo, quoad locupletiores auctores obtigerint.' A copy of the Summa of Antoninus, printed in 1485, is in the British Museum library, and the passage from it is correctly cited by Gretserus, vol. iv. tit. xi. cap. 4, § 3, ad fin. As, however, Antoninus was an archbishop of Florence, who died in 1459, his testimony (as Gretserus remarks), cannot be admitted with respect to Gregory the Great, who died in 604, eight and a-half centuries before his time. The story about the burning of Livy is probably founded on the general rumour that Gregory the Great destroyed an ancient library at Rome, stated by John of Salisbury, who wrote in the twelfth century. See Bayle, Dict. art. Gregoire I., notes M. and N.; the Art de vérifier les Dates, vol. iii. p. 278 (Paris, 1818), and a note in Biogr. Univ. art. Gregoire I, vol. xviii. p. 385. For an explanation of the causes which produced the loss of so large a part of the Roman historical literature, see Gibbon, Ouvrages et Caractère de Tite Live, Misc. Works, vol. iv. p. 43 (in 5 vols, 1814).

If therefore we require that a historical account should rest on the testimony of known and assignable witnesses, whose credibility can be scrutinized and judged, we shall find ourselves compelled to withhold our belief from the history of Rome, down to the landing of Pyrrhus in Italy, in the year 473 from the building of the city, or 281 B.C.

At this time, however, Rome had risen from the state of comparative weakness and obscurity in which she was at the time when she bent before the Gallic invaders, to a degree of military power, and political solidity, which enabled her to make head against Pyrrhus, the best general and combatant of his time, and finally to expel him from Italy. Even a generation earlier, during the Samnite wars, she had developed such military energies as to make Livy believe, from the traditions of that time, that she would have waged a successful conflict with Alexander the Great, if he had invaded Italy after his conquest of Asia.(49)

During the 473 years which are said to have elapsed from the foundation of Rome to the invasion of Pyrrhus, the institutions of the Roman state, both political and military, had assumed a definite, fixed, and peculiar form: and the Romans of later times believed themselves to be in possession of an authentic explanation of the origin and progress of these institutions, as well as of the steps by which the territorial dominion of their commonwealth had been successively extended, until it had attained the point at which it stood at the beginning of the Punic wars.

---

(49) See Livy, ix. 17—9. Alexander the Great died in 323 B.C. = 431 U.C.

§ 8 Before therefore we resign ourselves to any general and indiscriminating scepticism respecting the history of this period, let us examine the texture of the narrative of Roman history, from the earliest periods to which it is traced, down to the time of Pyrrhus; with the view of estimating the methods of criticism which have been applied to it by Niebuhr and other modern historians, and of judging whether any satisfactory tests of its credibility can be established.

For this purpose we will divide the history into certain periods, which it will be convenient to investigate separately, as their historical character, and the proportions in which fact and fiction are mixed, differ considerably.

The periods into which we propose to distribute the history are the following:—

1. Primitive history and ethnology of Italy.
2. The settlement of Æneas in Italy.
3. The Alban kingdom, and the foundation of Rome.
4. The period of the seven kings of Rome.
5. The period from the expulsion of the kings to the capture of the city by the Gauls.
6. The period from the capture of the city by the Gauls to the war with Pyrrhus.

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE PRIMITIVE HISTORY OF THE NATIONS OF ITALY.

§ 1 ACCORDING to the belief generally received among the Romans themselves, in the literary age of the Republic, and afterwards under the Empire, Rome was founded, about the year 753 B.C., by Romulus, a descendant of the royal house of Alba Longa. Alba, the metropolis of Rome, was supposed to have been a Latin town, and the head of the Latin confederacy.(1) The original population of Rome was regarded as Alban and Latin ;(2) but other elements derived from neighbouring nations, particularly the Sabines and the Etruscans, were related to have been afterwards added.(3) Dionysius strives hard to prove that the Romans were a Hellenic people;(4) but no trace exists of their ever having used any other language than the Latin; and the Latin, though belonging to the same family of languages, cannot be considered as a Hellenic dialect.

---

(1) Dion. Hal. i. 71. *ἀποικίαν στείλαντες Ἀλβανοί, Ῥωμύλου καὶ Ῥώμου τὴν ἡγεμονίαν αὐτῆς ἐχόντων, κτίζουσι Ῥώμην.* Compare the summary, ii. 2. On the ascendancy of Alba in Latium, see Dion. Hal. iii. 10, 31, 34. Festus in prætor ad portam. p. 241.

(2) Ita Numitori Albanâ permissâ re, Romulum Remumque cupido cepit in iis locis, ubi expositi, ubique educati erant, urbis condendæ. Et supererat multitudo Albanorum Latinorumque. Ad id pastores quoque accesserant. Livy, i. 6.

(3) Livy says of the Asylum, opened by Romulus: 'Eo ex finitimis populis turba omnis, sine discrimine liber an servus esset, avida novarum rerum perfugit.' i. 8. See also Dion. Hal. ii. 15, iii. 10; Plut. Rom. 9. Florus describes the Asylum as follows: 'Imaginem urbis magis quam urbem fecerat. Incolæ deerant. Erat in proximo lucus; hunc asylum facit: et statim mira vis hominum, Latini Tuscique pastores; quidam etiam transmarini, Phryges, qui sub Æneâ, Arcades, qui sub Evandro duce, influxerant. Ita et variis quasi elementis congregavit corpus unum, populumque Romanum ipse fecit.' i. 1, § 9. The Asylum is alluded to by Virgil, Æn. viii. 342-3. See also Ovid. Fast. iii. 429—34; Dio Cass. xlvii. 19. Strabo gives the following account of the Asylum: *μετὰ δὲ τὴν κτίσιν ἀνθρώπους σύγκλυδας ὁ Ῥωμύλος ἤθροιζεν, ἀποδείξας ἄσυλόν τι τέμενος μεταξὺ τῆς ἄκρας καὶ τοῦ Καπετωλίου, τοὺς δ᾽ ἐκεῖ καταφεύγοντας τῶν ἀστυγειτόνων πολίτας ἀποφαίνων.*—v. 3, § 2. Compare Hartung, Rel. der Römer, vol. ii. p. 55—8; Klausen, Æneas, vol. ii. p. 1086. Schwegler, vol. i. p. 459, 464.

The relations of races and nations, so far as they are dependent on language, religion, and some other hereditary distinctions, are indicated by permanent marks, which outlive the time when they originated. Certain inferences, founded on such enduring criteria, can be drawn from the historical times to the dark and unknown ages, with respect to the Roman people: several eminent writers, however, have attempted to go further, and to raise a larger portion of the veil which envelopes the character, affinities, and movements of the Italian nations in the period antecedent to contemporary history.

Niebuhr, who has explored this obscure region of antiquity with great industry and patience, thus lays down the principles which guided his learned researches, in the introductory portion of his History:—

'If a detailed map be framed according to reports, calculations, and bearings, it may deviate in every particular from absolute geographical correctness, and yet be substantially sufficient to give a notion of a country, and enable us to follow the events of its history. When contracted to a small scale, its variations from a precisely accurate one may scarcely be perceptible. So is it with many things handed down to us in the history of nations. If they are detached from their dates, and such other points as are most exposed to arbitrary and falsifying alterations; and if we do not suffer ourselves to be disturbed by partial incongruities, where there is no contradiction in the main, the limits of universal history will be greatly enlarged.

'Thus the legends and traditions collected in this Introduction, concerning the various tribes that flourished in the earliest times of Italy, furnish results which enable us to survey the most important turns of their destinies, and which carry us on so far, that, even beyond the Alps, some of the national movements in the west and north of Europe come within our widening horizon.'(5)

---

(4) See Dion. Hal. ii. 1, 2, where his results respecting the Greek origin of the Latins and Romans are summed up.

In this passage Niebuhr expresses his belief that the extant evidence respecting the primitive ethnology of Italy is such as to enable us to establish certain leading facts—certain historical landmarks—though we are unable to ascertain the details. Adopting his own metaphor, the triangulation of the map can be laid down, together with the places of certain prominent objects, though the detailed geographical features cannot be filled in.

There are indeed, as we have already observed, some conclusions respecting primitive ethnology which can be drawn with tolerable safety from the ascertained circumstances of a people in the historical period. Affinities of language, and resemblances of religious usages and other customs, which are likely to have existed for a long time, and to have been derived from a common origin, may authorize us in inferring national affinity and connexion: but as soon as we leave this secure foundation, and commit ourselves to the guidance of accounts which profess to be founded upon ancient tradition, we, in general, find ourselves floating about a boundless ocean without rudder or compass.

As we proceed with our researches into the early history of Rome, we shall perceive that it is characterized by discrepancy of testimony as to important events, while at the same time there is an absence of all reasonable ground for preferring one version to another. Now this feature of uncertain and ill-authenticated history is prominently exhibited in the accounts of the primitive ethnology of Italy. The systems of different writers are so dissimilar, that, if it were not for the recurrence of the same national names, we should scarcely be aware that the historical accounts which we had read all related to the same subject. The views, for instance, respecting the origin and affinity of the Etruscans and Tyrrhenians, have been almost as various as the treatises and dissertations which have been written respecting them.

---

(5) Hist. vol. i. p. 176.

When we come to examine the evidence on which the ethnological theories of the majority of antiquarian treatises are founded, our wonder at their wide, and indeed almost unlimited divergences is at an end. No probability is too faint, no conjecture is too bold, no etymology is too uncertain, to resist the credulity of an antiquarian in search of evidence to support an ethnological hypothesis. Gods become men, kings become nations, one nation becomes another nation,(6) opposites are interchanged,(7) at a stroke of the wand of the historical magician. Centuries are to him as minutes; nor indeed is space itself of much account, when national affinities are in question. Chronology, as Niebuhr remarks in the passage quoted above, forms no part of such history; dates, in such a context, are misleading and deceptive. To ask for the ordinary securities of historical truth—determinate assignable witnesses, whose credibility can be weighed and estimated—would be an impertinence; would imply an ignorance of the conditions of the problem, which are, that the events are antecedent to the period of regular history and contemporaneous registration.

---

(6) Thus Niebuhr considers the names Italus and Sikelus as identical, Hist. vol. i. p. 47. Compare p. 73, where he says: 'Here again, the Sicelians are the same people with the Italians.' But in vol. i. p. 169, n. 508, he seems to hesitate about identifying the Siculi and the Sicani. In p. 57, he says: 'In early times, the name of the Sicelians was equivalent to that of the Italians. It comprehended the Chonians also, *and thus corresponded entirely to that of the Œnotrians.*' In p. 47, he blames Dionysius for not perceiving that the Sicelians, Pelasgians, and Aborigines are different names for the same people: whereas Dionysius describes the Aborigines as attacking the Siceli, and, with the aid of the Pelasgians, expelling them from Italy. So far as Dionysius is concerned, the criticism is the same as if any one were to say, in discussing the evidence for the battle of Waterloo, that it was a historical error to distinguish between the French, the English, and the Prussians, for that they were only three different names for the same people. Again, in vol. i. note 60, he says that Thessalians, Pelasgians, and Tyrrhenians are different names of the same nation. In his Lectures, vol. i. p. 15, Niebuhr identifies the Siculi with the Itali; in p. 19, he identifies the Siculi with the Aborigines; and in p. 20, he identifies the Aborigines with the Pelasgians. 'Latinus in a different dialect was called Lavinus. In like manner the Latini were called Lavici, and Lavinium was the seat of their common sanctuary, like the Panionium. King Lacinius too in Œnotria is another phase of Latinus; and thus we see plainly that the Œnotrians also bore the name of Lacinians, and belonged to the same nation with the Latins.'—Hist. vol. i. p. 84. 'Lavinium is nothing else than a general name for Latium, just as Panionium is for Ionia; Latinus, Lavinus, and Lavicus being one and the same name.'—Lect. vol. i. p. 26. 'Turnus is nothing else but Turinus, in Dionysius Τυρρηνός; Lavinia, the fair maiden, is the name of the Latin people.'—ib. p. 27. Compare Hist. vol. i. p. 41, 193.

(7) Niebuhr remarks, Hist. vol. i. p. 40, that the 'inversion of a story into its opposite is a characteristic of legendary history.' In a note, he adds: 'Since a clear insight into the nature of these inversions will preserve us from a number of stumbling-blocks in the field of legendary history, *and turn statements which seem to militate against evident truths into testimonies in their favour*, it may be useful to promote such an insight by a few examples of very different kinds.' Compare p. 48. By an 'evident truth,' is here meant the arbitrary hypothesis of some modern historian, unsupported by a tittle of evidence.

Niebuhr remarks, that 'unless some boldness of divination be allowable, all researches into the early history of nations must be abandoned.'(8) The subject may be interesting, and our curiosity may be great; but because the authentic information is scanty, we must not therefore assume the liberty of setting aside well ascertained rules of historical evidence. To permit boldness of divination to supply the place of well-attested fact in inquiries into primitive ethnology, is similar to the ancient legal maxim, now happily exploded, that, in trials for atrocious crimes, a less degree of proof, than in ordinary cases, would suffice, and that the judge might outstep the law.(9) Where the temptation to evade a wholesome rule is not strong, it is likely to be observed. It is precisely in those cases where the temptation to transgress the sound rules of evidence, whether judicial or historical, is the strongest, that their observance ought to be most strictly enforced.

---

(8) Hist. vol. i. p. 152. In his Lectures, Niebuhr thus describes the obscurity and uncertainty of the early history of the Italian nations. 'These changes of nations, in which the earliest inhabitants were driven out by one tribe, and this again by another, are the causes which render the history of the early Italian nations so indescribably obscure and difficult for us, that, even where we ourselves have a clear view, the misconceptions in our authorities still maintain their ground, and ever and anon cause fresh discussions. A solution of these difficulties, free from all objections, is utterly impossible. He who is engaged in such investigations, must often be satisfied with evidence which has the appearance of truth, but he ought to be able to show how the misconceptions arose.'—vol. i. p. 18.

(9) In atrocioribus delictis leviora indicia sufficiunt, et licet judici jura transgredi.

Wherever articulate contemporary declarations have been preserved, ethnological is not less certain than other sorts of history. Thus the evidence by which the extension of the name *Italia* is traced from the small portion of land intercepted between the Scylletian and Napetine bays, and trending towards Sicily, to the whole of the peninsula south of the Alps, is clear and satisfactory.(10) In like manner, the national movements of the Huns, the Goths, the Vandals, the Lombards, and other barbarous tribes included in the history of Gibbon, are authenticated by the satisfactory testimony of living witnesses. But when we are deserted by contemporary testimony, and mount up to a time for which there is nothing but legends collected from a fluctuating oral tradition, and traceable to no definite source, we are destitute of any sound historical footing, and the accounts, though reported by eminent writers, are wholly uncertain.

§ 2 The fullest account of the primitive population of the region in which Rome afterwards stood is given by Dionysius, a learned and painstaking writer, who was probably master of all that Greek and Latin literature could contribute to the illustration of the subject in the Augustan age. According to his description, the various races of central Italy succeeded one another in the following order.

The earliest inhabitants of the Roman territory were (he says) the Siceli; a barbarous, or non-Hellenic, and an indigenous nation. No one could say whether, before their time, the country was inhabited by any other people, or was a complete wilderness.(11)

At an early period, a nation called the Aborigines, who had previously lived in unwalled villages among the mountains, receiving the assistance of some Pelasgians and other Greeks, attacked the Siceli, expelled them from the district between the Tiber and the Liris, and founded in it many cities. The

---

(10) See Niebuhr. Hist. vol. i. p. 15—21. The name of Italy had obtained its present extension in the time of Polybius, ii. 14. Compare Dion. Hal. i. 10; Strabo, v. ad init. Strabo makes the original Italy extend from the straits of Messina to the gulfs of Tarentum and Posidonia.

(11) Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 46.

Aborigines remained in undisturbed occupation of this region;(12) but in the reign of King Latinus, who ruled over them at the time of the Trojan war, they began to obtain the appellation of Latins.(13)

The Pelasgians, who joined the Aborigines, had come from Thessaly by sea, and had landed in Italy at the mouth of the Po. Hence they moved southwards into the country possessed by the Umbrians, from whom they took some cities; and were about to attack the Aborigines, when an oracle given to the Pelasgians, at Dodona,(14) produced a reconciliation. The Aborigines then assigned a portion of territory near Velia to the Pelasgians, and with their aid succeeded in expelling the Siceli.(15)

The Siceli, or Siculi, are described as emigrating in a body, with their wives and children, and their precious metal. They moved near the coast to the south, and crossed the Straits of Messina, on rafts, by watching a favourable moment of the current.(16) The island was then inhabited by a thin population of Sicani, an Iberian tribe, from whom it was called Sicania;

---

(12) In the passage of Dionysius, *ὀνομάτων ἀλλαγαῖς [αὐταῖς] οἱ αὐτοὶ ἄνθρωποι προσαγορευόμενοι*, the word *αὐταῖς* seems superfluous. If any word is retained, the sense requires *μόναις*.

(13) Dion. Hal. i. 9, and 45. Compare i. 60, ii. 1.

(14) This oracle, which is cited at length in Dion. Hal. i. 19, is evidently a late fabrication. See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. note 7, who suspects the honesty of Dionysius, but without sufficient reason. He says that Lucius Mamius (for which Manlius and Mamilius have been conjectured,) a man of note, testifies that he had seen the verses inscribed in ancient letters on a tripod in the sacred precinct of Jupiter. The oracle is likewise cited by Varro, ap. Macrob. Sat. i 7, § 28. Varro died in 28 B.C., and the history of Dionysius was not published till 7 B.C. See i. 3.

(15) Dion. Hal. i. 16—21, 30 ad fin. He specifies Antenna, Tellena, Ficulnea, and Tibur (a part of which in his own time was called Sicelion), as having been taken by the Aborigines from the Siceli, c. 16, and the towns of Cære, Pisa, Saturnia, Alsium, Phalerium and Fescennia, as having been jointly inhabited by the Aborigines and Pelasgians. c. 20, 21. The Pelasgians and Aborigines likewise took Cortona in Etruria from the Umbrians, c. 20, 26. See Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 102.

(16) *σὺν χρόνῳ κατασκευασάμενοι σχεδίας ἐπὶ τῷ πορθμῷ, καὶ φυλάξαντες κατιόντα τὸν ῥοῦν.* This circumstance is borrowed from Thuc. vi. 2. *ὡς μὲν εἰκὸς, καὶ λέγεται, ἐπὶ σχεδιῶν τηρήσαντες τὸν πορθμὸν κατιόντος τοῦ ἀνέμου.* As this passage of the Siceli, according to Thucydides himself, took place in 1036 B.C. or 565 years before his birth, the oral tradition to which he refers could have had no value.

but the Siceli gradually spread over it, and from them it acquired the name of Sicily.(17) Such is the account of these primitive national movements given by Dionysius.

The subjugation of the Siceli in Latium, and their consequent removal into Sicily, are regarded by modern critical historians as ascertained points in the early ethnography of Italy. Niebuhr describes this event as 'the earliest of any authority in the history of Italy.'(18) Müller speaks of it as resting on the 'firm tradition of antiquity.'(19) It is therefore material to observe how it was represented by different ancient writers. Hellanicus of Lesbos (who was born twenty-five years before Thucydides) said that in the third generation before the Trojan war, in the twenty-sixth year of Alcyone, the priestess of Argos, there were two Italian expeditions into Sicily; the first, consisting of Elymi(20) dislodged by the Œnotrians; the second, which occurred five years afterwards, of Ausonians driven out by the Iapygians. The king of these Ausonians, was, according to Hellanicus, named Sicelus, from whom the people and the island derived their appellation.(21) If we assume thirty years as the length of a generation, and adopt the year of Eratosthenes for the taking of Troy, and therefore reckon about eighty years before 1184 B.C., we shall obtain 1264 B.C. as the date of these migrations, according to Hellanicus: that is to say, 768 years before his birth.(22) Philistus of Syracuse, who was born about sixty years after Hellanicus, but lived nearer the theatre of these legendary events, agreed with that historian as to the time of the migration into Sicily, inasmuch as he fixed it in the eightieth year before the Trojan war; but he differed in every other particular; for he described the nation which crossed over from Italy as being neither the Siceli, nor the Ausones, nor the Elymi, but the Ligyes, driven from their own territory by the Umbrians and Pelasgians. These Ligyes, he added, were led by Sicelus, the son of Italus, and from him they acquired the name of Siceli. Antiochus of Syracuse, who lived about 423 B.C., described the immigrants as Siceli, driven into the island by the Œnotri and Opici; but he did not determine the time of the migration.(23) Thucydides agrees in substance with Antiochus; for he describes the Siceli as having been forced from Italy into Sicily by the Opici, but he differs from Hellanicus and Philistus as to the time; for he places the date of the event nearly 300 years before the first Greek settlement in Sicily;(24) that is to say, 300 years before the foundation of Naxos,(25) which is fixed by the ancient chronologers at 736 B.C. This would give 1036 B.C. as the date of Thucydides for the Sicelian migration; whereas the date of Hellanicus and Philistus is 1264 B.C., or 228 years earlier.(26)

---

(17) Dion. Hal. i. 22. The Iberian origin of the Sicani was borrowed by Dionysius from Thucyd. vi. 1; Philistus, ap. Diod. v. 6; and Ephorus ap. Strab. vi. 2, § 4. It was, however, denied by Timæus, who considered the Sicani as autochthones, Diod. ib. The river Sicanus in Iberia seems to be a fiction. See the testimonies collected in Ukert, Geogr. der Gr. und Röm. vol. ii. part 1, p. 246. According to Strab. vi. 2, § 4, there were Iberians in Sicily in the historical age. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 169; Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, p. 473, n. The name Sicania in Odyss. xxiv. 307, does not denote any real country.

(18) Hist. vol. i. p. 47; lower down, p. 82, he seems to doubt the historical character of this supposed event, for he says: 'It is certainly very questionable whether this migration be more authentic than other pretended traditions of the same kind; or not rather, like them, a mere inference and presumption.'

(19) Etrusker, vol. i. p. 10.

(20) The Elymi are said by Thucydides to have been Trojans who settled in Sicily after the capture of Troy, mixed with some Phocians, vi. 2. In Strabo. xiii. 1, § 53, Elymus, a Trojan, is the founder of the colony. Compare Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, p. 479, 485. In a passage of Antiochus quoted by Paus. x. 11, § 3, the Elymi are mentioned in connection with a story relating to the settlement of the Lipari islands; but the story, like most other colonial legends, is doubtful.

(21) Dion. Hal. i. 22.

---

(22) He was born 496 B.C.

(23) Dion. Hal. i. 22. This passage ought apparently to be written as follows:—'Αντίοχος δ' ὁ Συρακόσιος χρόνον μὲν οὐ δηλοῖ τῆς διαβάσεως, Σικελοὺς δὲ μετονομασθῆναι τοὺς μεταναστάντας ἀποφαίνει, βιασθέντας ὑπό τ' Οἰνωτρῶν καὶ 'Οπικῶν, Σικελὸν ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἀποικίας ποιησαμένους. The word μετονομασθῆναι is adopted from the Vatican MS. Σικελὸν is an emendation of Sylburg for στρατῶν.

(24) vi. 2.

(25) Thuc. vi. 3. Diodorus describes the Sicani as the primitive inhabitants of the island, and as retiring to the Western extremity in consequence of an eruption of Ætna. Hereupon, the whole nation of the Siceli crossed over from Italy, and took possession of the vacant territory.—v. 2 and 6.

(26) According to Justin, iv. 2, Sicily was first called Trinacria, afterwards Sicania. Its primitive inhabitants were the Cyclopes; when they

Dionysius elsewhere cites a more detailed account of the early population of Italy (in its limited sense) from Antiochus; which completes his description of the steps by which the Sicelian migration into Sicily was effected. According to this account (which is alleged to be founded on the most credible and distinct of the ancient traditions), (27) Italy, the promontory intercepted between Tarentum and Posidonia, was originally occupied by the Œnotri; these Œnotri were, in process of time, governed by a king Italus, from whom they took the name of Itali.

---

were extinct, Cocalus became king of the island; and after him, the cities were governed by despots. Nothing is here said of the Siceli: Cocalus is a mythical king, who is described as having received Dædalus when he fled from Minos in Crete; see Diod. iv. 77—9; Paus. i. 21, § 4; vii. 4, § 6. Conon Narr. 25; Philist. fr. 1, ed. Didot; Ephor. fr. 99. In Æn. vi. 17, Dædalus is described as taking refuge in Cumæ, not in Sicily. Antiochus began his history with Cocalus, Diod. xii. 71. Dædalus was the cause of the death of Minos; for the daughters of Cocalus killed Minos in a bath, by pouring scalding water upon him, (or boiling pitch, according to one version of the story,) in order to save Dædalus, who had taken refuge with him. See Wagner Trag. Gr. Fragm. vol. i. p. 293, on the Καμίκιοι of Sophocles; Ovid. Met. viii. 261. On the early population of Sicily, see Grote, vol. iii. p. 461—70. Compare vol. i. p. 307—11. The information which Philistus might have collected from Iberian mercenaries in the service of the Elder Dionysius respecting the Iberian origin of the Sicani (Grote, p. 462), could scarcely have been of much value. The following sketch of the primitive history of Sicily, and of its early changes of population, is given by Silius, at the beginning of the fourteenth book of his Punica:—

'Post dirum Antiphatæ sceptrum et Cyclopia regna,
Vomere verterunt primum nova rura Sicani.
Pyrene misit populos, qui nomen ab amne
Adscitum patrio terræ imposuere vacanti.
Mox Ligurum pubes, Siculo ductore, novavit
Possessis bello mutata vocabula regnis.
Nec Cres dedecori fuit accola: duxerat actos
Mœnibus e centum non fausta ad prælia Minos,
Dædaleam repetens pœnam, qui fraude nefandâ
Postquam perpetuas judex concessit ad umbras,
Cocalidum insidiis, fesso Minoia turba
Bellandi studio Siculis subsedit in oris.
Miscuerunt Phrygiam prolem Trojanus Acestes,
Trojanusque Helymus, structis qui, pube secutâ,
In longum ex sese donarunt nomina muris.'—xiv. 33-47.

The series indicated in these verses is,—1. The Cyclopes and the Læstrygones; 2. The Sicani, from Iberia; 3. The Ligurians, under king Siculus; 4. Cretans, under Minos, who was killed by the daughters of Cocalus; 5. Trojans, under Acestes and Helymus.

(27) Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεως τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίας, ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα.—Ap. Dion. Hal. i. 12.

Italus, growing old, was succeeded by Morges, from whom the people were called Morgetes. During his reign, a fugitive named Sicelus came to him from Rome, which city existed before the Trojan war. Sicelus, having become the guest of Morges, succeeded in obtaining a share of his power; he divided the nation, and gave to a section of it his own name. 'Hence,' said Antiochus, 'different portions of the Œnotrian population were called Siceli, and Morgetes, and Itali.'(28) It appears, from the independent testimony of Strabo, that there was in Sicily a tribe which bore the name of Morgetes.(29)

From these discordant accounts, no satisfactory result can be obtained. None is founded on any ascertainable contemporary evidence; and no legitimate ground therefore exists for preferring any one to the others. That the Siceli dwelt in Sicily in the historical age, we know from certain testimony.(30) Nor can it be doubted that the island was called after their name; in the same manner that the Itali gave their name to the promontory projecting towards Sicily, which was afterwards extended to the whole peninsula south of the Alps. Thucydides distinctly states that there were in his time Siceli in Italy;(31) and it is not improbable that the Locrian traditions preserved by Polybius,(32) which describe the Siceli as having formerly occupied the site of Locri, may rest on a basis of truth, though we are now unable to trace them to an authentic source. But the stories respecting the occupation of Latium and the country between the Tiber and Liris by the Siceli, and of their subsequent migration across the Straits of Messina to Sicily, come to us without any authentication, and cannot be admitted as historical.(33) Italus and Sicelus, as individual kings, stand on the same footing as Hellen, Ion, Dorus, Danaus, Ægyptus, Latinus, Tyrrhenus, and so many other royal names which have been coined out of gentile appellatives, and are equally fictitious and unreal.(34) Where nothing was known, all persons were at liberty to guess; and hence Hellanicus of Lesbos is said to have explained the name of Italy as alluding to a calf (vitulus) which had strayed from the oxen of Geryon, when they were driven by Hercules in Italy.(35) Others, again, rejected this mythological explanation, but, holding to the same etymology, traced the name to the abundance of cattle in Italy.(36) The licence of imagination did not however stop here; for other accounts represented Italus as a king of the Ligurians; or as a Molossian; or as a Corcyræan; or as a son of Venus, who was king of the Lucanians.(37) Moreover, one story inverts the course of migration described by Dionysius; and instead of making the Sicelians move from Latium to Sicily, it brings Italus, king of Sicily, to central Italy.(38)

---

(28) Dion. Hal. i. 12 and 73.

(29) vi. 2, § 4. Dion. Hal. i. 35, says that Antiochus makes Italy the country included between the Napetine and the Scylletian gulfs. Compare i. 73. See Casaubon on i. 73 (p. 186, ed. Reiske), where the discrepancies in the reports of Antiochus' accounts are pointed out.

(30) See Thuc. vi. 2.

(31) *εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ Σικελοί.* vi. 2. By Ἰταλία Thucydides doubtless means the south-western promontory of the Italian peninsula.

(32) xii. 5 and 6. Polybius speaks of their *παραδόσιμος περὶ τῆς ἀποικίας φήμη παρὰ τῶν πατέρων.*

The following article of Festus supposes Magna Græcia to have derived its name from a Siculian immigration: 'Major Græcia dicta est Italia, quod eam Siculi quondam obtinuerunt, vel quod multæ magnæque civitates in eâ fuerunt ex Græciâ profectæ;' Festus, p. 131.

---

(33) The presence of Siculi, or Sicani, in Latium, does not rest on any historical basis. Gellius and Macrobius say generally, 'Auruncorum, aut Sicanorum, aut Pelasgorum, qui primi coluisse in Italiâ dicuntur;' N. A. i. 10; Sat. i. 5. In Æn. xi. 316, 17, King Latinus describes a part of his territory as bounded by the Sicani:

'Est antiquus ager Tusco mihi proximus amni,
Longus, in occasum, fines super usque Sicanos.'

Compare vii. 795, 'Auruncæque manus, Rutuli, veteresque Sicani;' and viii. 328, 'Tum manus Ausonia et gentes venere Sicanæ.' The Dodonæan oracle, in Dion. Hal. i. 19, and Macrob. Sat. i. 7, which mentions Σικελῶν Σατόρνιαν αἶαν, is a manifest fabrication (above, p. 273, n. 14). Varro, ap. Macrob. ib., describes the Pelasgi as subjugating the Siculian population of Latium; agreeing in this respect with Dionysius; but the whole narrative is imaginary. The Siculi are mentioned with the Aborigines, Pelasgians, Arcadians, Aurunci, and Rutuli, as the ancient inhabitants of Latium, by Pliny, N. H. iii. 9. Compare Klausen, Æneas, p. 781; Schwegler, ib. p. 202.

(34) Est locus, Hesperiam Graii cognomine dicunt,
Terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glebæ.
Œnotri coluere viri: nunc fama minores
Italiam dixisse *ducis de nomine* gentem.
Æn. i. 530—3.

Compare Heyne, Exc. xxi. ad Æn. i.

(35) Dion. Hal. i. 35. Compare Varro, L. L. v. 99; Dio Cassius, vol. i. p. 4, ed. Bekker; Apollod. ii. 5, § 10.

(36) Timæus and Varro ap. Gell. N. A. xi. 1; Servius ad Æn. i. 533.

(37) These different stories respecting Italus are collected by Servius on Æn. i. 533. There is a fifth account which makes Italus an augur who

Dionysius says that the name and extraction of the Aborigines were differently explained by different writers. Some made them an indigenous Italian race; that is, a race which originally sprung from the soil; deriving their name from *origo*. Others conceived them as wanderers, and explained their name as *Aberrigines*—a clumsy and unfaithful etymology.(39) Others described them as a colony of the Ligyes, or Ligurians: but Cato and others of the most learned historians considered them to have been a colony of Greeks, who came to Italy many generations before the Trojan war. 'These Latin historians however (says Dionysius) neither specify the race of Greeks to which the colonists belonged, nor the city from which they migrated, nor the time of the migration, nor the leader of the colony, nor the cause of their leaving the mother city: moreover, although the story relates to Greece, they adduce no testimony of any writer on Grecian affairs.' Dionysius is perplexed by these difficulties, and is uncertain which version is true.(40) He inclines however to believe that, if the Aborigines were of Hellenic descent, they were a colony of the Œnotrians, who were themselves of Arcadian extraction; and that the Aborigines being, like their progenitors the Arcadians, mountaineers in their habits, derived their name from the Greek ὄρη.(41) Having thus succeeded in tracing the Aborigines, both in their national genealogy, and their name, to

---

came with the Siculi into Italy, and who seems to have married a daughter of Minos; but this part of the passage is corrupt and nearly unintelligible.

(38) 'Italus rex Siciliæ ad eam partem venit, in quâ regnavit Turnus, quam a suo nomine appellavit Italiam;' Servius ad Æn. i. 533.

(39) It is however adopted by Festus, p. 19; and it is mentioned by the Scriptor de Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 4.

(40) i. 10, 11. Strabo conceives the Aborigines to be a peculiar nation, dwelling near the site of Rome, like the Æqui, Volsci, and Hernici; and not to be a general name for the primitive population of Italy; v. 3, § 2. Cicero likewise seems to take the same view, when he says that Romulus did not choose a site for Rome in the country of the Rutulians and Aborigines, or at the mouth of the Tiber; De Rep. ii. 3.

(41) The writer de Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 4. mentions the derivation from ὄρη.

a Greek source, he entreats any of his readers, who may be reluctant to receive reports about ancient things without inquiry, not to believe readily that the Aborigines were of Ligurian or Umbrian, or any other barbarian origin; but to examine the rest of the evidence, and thus to satisfy themselves as to the most probable result.(42)

Nobody now will accede to the explanation of Dionysius, or will doubt that the obvious Latin etymology of *aborigines* is the true one.(43) The name was applied to a primitive Italian race at a comparatively early date;(44) but there is no ground for adopting the view of Dionysius, which makes it a national appellation, and identifies it with a people having a historical existence.(45)

Sallust speaks of them as the primitive inhabitants of Italy, while they were as yet in a savage state; in the state of mankind which Æschylus represents as preceding the lessons of Prometheus, and which Lucretius conceives as the starting point in the progress of civil society.(46) Livy probably regarded them in nearly the same light, when he connected them with king Latinus as his subjects, at the arrival of Æneas in Italy;(47) but of the separate national existence of the Aborigines as a people who occupied a definite position in time and space, and of whom certain acts can be predicated, there is not a shadow of evidence.

---

(42) Ib. c. 13, cf. 60; ii. i.

(43) Dionysius translates the word by *γενάρχαι* or *πρωτόγονοι*, i. 10. Saufeius, an unknown writer quoted by Servius, explains the name as follows;—'Saufeius Latium dictum ait, quod ibi latuerint incolæ, qui, quoniam in cavis montium vel occultis, caventes sibi a feris belluis, vel a valentioribus, vel a tempestatibus, habitaverint, Casci vocati sunt; quos posteri Aborigines nominaverunt, quoniam aliis ortos esse recognoscebant;' Serv. ad Æn. i. 6. The latter part of this passage is not intelligible. Niebuhr proposes 'ab illis se ortos;' Hist. vol. i. n. 248. The sense seems to require 'quoniam a diis ortos esse,' or 'quoniam a nullis aliis ortos esse.' Saufeius first traces the name *Casci* to *cava* and *cavere;* he afterwards explains the etymology of Aborigines. Niebuhr takes the correct view of the question. 'This name is said to mean *ancestors*. But it is surely simpler to interpret it of those who were the inhabitants of the country from the beginning, answering to the Greek *Autochthones;*' Hist. vol. i. p. 80. On the Sacrani (as corresponding with the Aborigines), see Festus, p. 321; with the article ver sacrum, p. 379; and Servius, Æn. vii. 796. For the connexion of the Aborigines with a ver sacrum, see Dion. Hal. i. 16; ii. 1.

(44) Callias, ap. Dion. Hal. i. 72, appears to have used the name. He was contemporary with Agathocles, who died in 289 B.C.; Lycophron, v. 1253. See Fragm. Hist. vol. ii. p. 383; Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 80.

(45) Niebuhr, ib., says that 'it manifestly was never the real name of any people.'

(46) Aborigines, genus hominum agreste, sine legibus, sine imperio, liberum atque solutum; Catil. 6. Tacitus, Ann. xi. 14, represents the Ab-

§ 3 After a time (Dionysius proceeds to say) the Pelasgians of Latium and central Italy were visited with barrenness both of the earth and of their own wives, as a divine punishment for a misunderstood oracle. The erroneous interpretation was cured by a colonial decimation, or a *ver sacrum*, but the remedy caused dissensions among them; and at length, nearly the whole people emigrated in separate bodies, and thus became scattered over Greece.(48) Hence, too, Dionysius adds, as the western coast of Italy was known to the Greeks as Tyrrhenia, these Pelasgians

---

origines as learning the use of letters from Evander: which implies a barbarous condition. Justin describes the Aborigines as being in that primitive social state, in which all things are in common, and no right of private property has been established. 'Italiæ cultores primi Aborigines fuere: quorum rex Saturnus tantæ justitiæ fuisse traditur, ut neque servierit sub illo quisquam, neque quicquam privatæ rei habuerit, sed omnia communia et indivisa omnibus fuerint, veluti unum cunctis patrimonium esset;' xliii. 1. The picture of the indigenous population of Italy, prior to the Golden Age under the reign of Saturn, which Evander gives to Æneas, probably coincides with the conception of the Aborigines formed by Sallust and Tacitus.

> 'Hæc nemora indigenæ Fauni Nymphæque tenebant,
> Gensque virûm truncis et duro robore nata:
> Queis neque mos neque cultus erat; nec jungere tauros,
> Aut componere opes norant, aut parcere parto,
> Sed rami atque asper victu venatus alebat.'
>
> Æn. viii. 314-8.

Of Latium, between the Tiber and Circeii, Pliny says: 'Colonis sæpe mutatis, tenuere alii aliis temporibus, Aborigines, Pelasgi, Arcades, Siculi, Aurunci, Rutuli;' Nat. Hist. iii. 9. From the order in which these names stand, it may be inferred that Pliny, like Sallust, considered the Aborigines as the primeval population of Latium, and that he did not, like Dionysius, conceive them as an immigrating people, who overpowered and expelled the Siculi.

The subject of the Aborigines and Siculi is treated by Schwegler, vol. i. p. 198-212, with a general abstinence from positive results, though he thinks it a credible tradition that a people settled in the Reatine country descended into the lower plains of the Tiber (p. 206).

(47) See i. 1, 2.

(48) i. 23-5. Compare Myrsilus in c. 28.

acquired the appellation of Tyrrhenian, and were called Tyrrhenian Pelasgians.(49)

This portion of the narrative of Dionysius is merely an ethnological legend, invented for the purpose of explaining the existence of the national name of Pelasgian, in distant and unconnected parts of Greece, as well as the gentile appellation of Tyrrhenian, which had been sometimes connected with it. The supposed wanderings of the Pelasgians, which are mentioned by other ancient writers, have grown out of a similar attempt.(50) No authentic record of the migrations or acts of the Pelasgian people appears to have been accessible to the historians of antiquity. Dionysius considers the Tyrrhenians, or Etruscans, as an indigenous Italian tribe, neither allied with the Pelasgians or Greeks, nor (according to a legend generally adopted in antiquity) derived from the Lydians.(51) So far as this opinion implies that the Etruscans were a people whose natural origin and affinity cannot be traced beyond the limits of the territory occupied by them in Italy, it appears to rest on a solid foundation.(52)

---

(49) i. 25-8. This passage is extracted and illustrated by Mr. Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i. p. 24-8. Mr. Clinton concludes by saying that 'these testimonies in Dionysius establish the *fact* that Pelasgi from Greece emigrated to Italy; but the *circumstances* and the *time* of that earliest migration are lost in remote antiquity' (p. 28). The fact itself seems as uncertain as the circumstances and the time. Mr. Clinton does not advert to the statement of Dionysius respecting a migration of Pelasgians from Italy back to Greece; which is an essential part of his narrative. According to Diod. xiv. 113, some writers reported that Pelasgians of Thessaly fled from the deluge of Deucalion before the Trojan war, and settled in northern Italy.

(50) Wachsmuth, Hell. Alt., vol. i. part i. p. 26, ed. 1, remarks with truth that there were two opposite and inconsistent views respecting the Pelasgians in antiquity. The one represented them as a fixed and stationary, the other as a moveable and migratory people. The former opinion is adopted by Herodotus; i. 56. The latter is mentioned in Strabo, xiii. 3, § 3, where the Pelasgi are described as πολύπλανον καὶ ταχὺ τὸ ἔθνος πρὸς ἀπαναστάσεις. The authors of the Atthides said that διὰ τὸ πλανήτας εἶναι καὶ δίκην ὀρνέων ἐπιφοιτᾶν ἐφ' οὓς ἔτυχε τόπους Πελαργοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀττικῶν κληθῆναι, ib. v. 2, § 4. In ix. i. § 18, the statement is repeated, that the Pelasgians were called πελαργοὶ by the Athenians on account of their wandering habits. The same view recurs in Plutarch, Rom. i. This radical inconsistency in the views respecting the Pelasgians is an additional proof that they rest on no historical basis. For a copious collection of passages respecting the Pelasgians, see Kruse's Hellas, vol. ii. p. 393-461, with the comments of Bishop Thirlwall, Philological Museum, vol. i. p. 315; and Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i. p. 5-30, 92-8.

(51) i. 29. 30. He says that the nation is ἀρχαῖόν τε πάνυ, καὶ οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ γένει οὔτε ὁμόγλωσσον οὔτε ὁμοδίαιτον εὑρίσκεται, c. 30. The original authority for the Lydian origin of the Etruscan nation is Herod. i. 94. He is followed by Timæus, and a long line of writers, Greek and Latin; and the national affinity was publicly recognised in later times (Tac. Ann. iv. 55); but the conjecture of Schwegler (vol. i. p. 253, 4), that Herodotus alone was the source of the statement, has much probability.

§ 4 The next addition of population which (according to Dionysius) this part of Italy received, was a colony from Pallantium, an Arcadian town, situated near Tegea, not far from the Laconian boundary.(53) This expedition was placed about sixty years before the Trojan war; the leader of it was Evander,(54) the son of Mercury and of a native Arcadian nymph, called by the Greeks, Themis or Nicostrata, and by the Romans, Carmenta.(55) Faunus, the son or descendant of Mars,(56) was king of the Aborigines when the Arcadian expedition of Evander arrived;(57) he received them hospitably, and assigned them as much land as they wished to take. The Arcadian colony of Evander was not (as Dionysius informs us) sent out by the common consent of the state, but was a secession of a part of the people produced by civil discord:(58) the seceders were only numerous enough to fill two ships, and they chose for their habitation a hill near the Tiber, on the site of the future Rome. Here they built a small town, to which they gave the name of Pallantium, from their Arcadian metropolis.(59)

---

(52) The speculations of Niebuhr, Müller, and other modern writers on the national origin of the Etruscans, are concisely and luminously summed up by Schwegler, ib. p. 253-67. He himself rejects both the Lydian origin of Herodotus and the Pelasgian origin of Hellanicus, and supposes the resemblance between the name of the Tyrrhenians of Greece and the Tyrrhenians of Italy to be accidental: he derives them both from τύρσις, and supposes that both nations obtained their name independently from their great works of building. The statement of Dionysius respecting the native name *Rasena* or *Rasenna* for the Etruscans stands unsupported, and is uncertain, even if we suppose the word to be correctly written, a question which is always doubtful with respect to an unknown proper name which occurs only once. (See Schwegler, p. 255.) It may be reasonably assumed that the names *Etruria*, *Etrusci*, and *Tusci*, were appellations applied by the natives to the inhabitants of the centre and west of Italy, who infested the Italian and Sicilian waters with their piracies. In forming proper names, slight resemblances of sound were sufficient to satisfy the Greeks, and it is not an improbable conjecture that the early Ionian navigators may have applied to the Etrurians their own ethnic name Τυρσηνοί or Τυρρηνοί, as a near approximation to the native name. The historical theories which connected the Italian Etruscans with the Greek Pelasgians may then have been founded on this accidental coincidence. Euripides, Med. 1342, 1359, who applied the epithet Tyrrhenian to Scylla, and says that she inhabited the Tyrrhenian plain, uses the word as equivalent to *Italian*. Compare Hesiod, Theog. 1015; Herod. i. 163; Thuc. vii. 53, 4; Strab. v. 2, § 2. The Latin *Turs-cus*, according to the form in the Eugubian tables, which is itself very close to *Etrus-cus*, is faithfully represented by Τυρσ-ηνός, the ancient Greek form: as Schwegler has remarked.

The language of the Rhæti in northern Italy resembled that of the Etruscans, and they were hence considered by the ancients as a remnant of the Etruscan nation in its original extension over the valley of the Po, and as far as the Alps. See Schwegler, ib. p. 268; Donaldson's Varronianus, p. 17, ed 2.

(53) See Pausan. viii. 43. Pallas, the son of Lycaon. founded Pallantium, Paus. viii. 3, 1; Hesiod. ap. Steph. Byz. in Παλλάντιον. A temple and statue of Pallas were at Pallantium; ib. viii. 43. § 5; also a statue of Evander. Antoninus Pius made Pallantium a libera civitas, and gave it freedom from taxation, on account of its being the birthplace of Evander; ib. 43, § 1.

(54) Of Evander, Livy says: 'Evander tum ea, profugus ex Peloponneso, auctoritate magis quam imperio regebat loca; venerabilis vir miraculo literarum, rei novæ inter rudes artium homines;' i. 7.

---

(55) Themis, or Nicostrata, or Carmenta, was the mother of Evander; Plut. Quæst. Rom. c. 56; Strab. v. 3, § 3. Carmenta, as the mother of Evander, and a prophetess who predicted the fortune of Rome; Æn. viii. 333-41; Ovid, Fast. i. 461-586; Livy, i. 7; Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 5; Plut. Rom. 20; Solinus, i. 1, § 10, 13. She is likewise alluded to in the explanatory legend of Fast. i. 617-636. The Carmentis saxa on the Capitol are mentioned in Livy, v. 47; on the Porta Carmentalis, see Becker, vol. i. p. 936-9; and concerning Carmenta, Hartung, Rel. der Römer, vol. ii. p. 198; Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, p. 883. According to one account, Mercury is not the father of Evander, but of his mother Nicostrata; Serv. Æn. viii. 130. Paus. viii. 43, 2, says that Evander was the son of Mercury, and of a nymph, the daughter of the river Ladon, and that he was the first of the Arcadians both in wisdom and military valour. According to another story, Evander is the son of Echemus, a mythical king of Arcadia, and of Timandra, the daughter of Tyndareus and Leda; Serv. Æn. viii. 130; Apollod. iii. 10, § 6. The marriage of Echemus and Timandra was mentioned by Hesiod, Schol. Pind. Ol. xi. 79 (Fragm. 8. ed. Göttling). If the notice in Servius, ib., is correct, the affinity of Evander was laid down by Hesiod.

(56) According to Virgil, Faunus was the son of Picus, and Picus was the son of Saturn, beyond whom the genealogy is not traced; Æn. vii. 45-9. See below, ch. ix. § 1.

(57) Faunus, according to Dionysius, was *ἀνὴρ μετὰ τοῦ δραστηρίου καὶ συνετός*, i. 31. These words are borrowed from the character of Theseus in Thucydides, ii. 15; *γενόμενος μετὰ τοῦ ξυνετοῦ καὶ δυνατός*. Dionysius had doubtless as much ground for attributing these qualities to Faunus, as Thucydides had for attributing them to Theseus, and no more.

(58) Virgil, in like manner, represents Evander as saying—

Me, *pulsum patriâ*, pelagique extrema sequentem,
Fortuna omnipotens et ineluctabile fatum
His posuere locis.—Æn. viii. 333-5.

According to one account, he was banished from his native city, on account of his having murdered his father, an act which he committed at the instigation of his mother Nicostrata; Serv. Æn. viii. 51. Others represented the cause of his exile to have been that he killed his mother Nicostrata when she was 110 years old. The Arcadians were then very long-lived, and sometimes reached the age of 300 years; Serv. ib. The anger of a god is made the cause of Evander's exile, by Ovid. Fast. i. 481-2. Pausan. viii. 43, § 2, speaks of Evander as *σταλέντα ἐς ἀποικίαν*; which expression seems to imply a voluntary expedition.

The story of Evander and the Arcadian colony of Pallantium is evidently of Greek origin, and was devised for the purpose of explaining the name of Palatium or the Palatine hill, from the name of the Arcadian town. At what time this mythological connexion was established, and when the legend assumed a fixed form, we are unable to discover;(60) but it probably originated as soon as Greek literature penetrated into Rome, and the relations with Greece became frequent. Virgil simply traces the name to Pallas, the ancestor of the Arcadian colony,(61) and the eponymous hero of the Arcadian Pallantium; from him, Pallas, the son of Evander, whose untimely death is so well known to the readers of the Æneid, is supposed to be named. Polybius—whose Arcadian origin doubtless made him take an interest in this legendary connexion of Pallantium and the Palatine hill—traced the name of the latter to Pallas, a son of Hercules and Launa, the daughter of Evander, who accompanied his father-in-law to Italy, and was buried by him on the Palatium; whence it derived its name.(62)

---

(59) Dion. Hal. i. 31-3, 40. Compare Varro de L. L. v. 53. Evander was the grandson of Pallas, king of Arcadia. According to Varro and others, however, the Palatine hill was not named after Pallas, the ancestor of Evander, but from Pallantia a daughter of Evander, loved by Hercules, or from his son Pallas; Serv. Æn. viii. 51. According to one account, Pallas the ancestor of Evander was a son of Ægeus, who was expelled from Athens by his brother Theseus, and removed to Arcadia, where he became king; Serv. Æn. viii. 54. According to the Athenian mythology, Pallas, from whom the Athenian Pallantidæ traced their descent, was the son of Pandion, and the brother of Ægeus: see Apollod. iii. 15, § 5; Plut. Thes. 3, 13. The deme of Pallene at Athens likewise received its name from this Pallas; Plut. ib. 13.

The tubilustria—certain days in which trumpets were purified by a sacrifice of lambs—are traced to the Arcadian Pallanteum, in a mutilated article of Festus, p. 352.

(60) The attempt of Niebuhr to trace the legend to a native Siculian (or Pelasgian) population in Latium is unsuccessful; Hist. vol. i. p. 86. It leaves unexplained the cardinal point of the story; viz., the connexion with the Arcadian town of Pallantium. Niebuhr thinks that Evander is 'only another form of Latinus;' ib. p. 89. It is difficult to assign any limit to the aberrations of mythology; but in the legendary story which is reported to us, Latinus is a native indigenous king—whereas Evander is invariably a foreigner and an immigrant. See Æn. vii. 47; viii. 51-5; Livy, i. 1, 7; Paus. viii. 43.

(61) Æn. vii. 51-4. Pallas, the freedman of the Emperor Claudius, was pleased by the flattery of those who referred his origin to this ancient Arcadian hero; Tac. Ann. xii. 53: a good example of the perfectly arbitrary manner in which heroic genealogies were fabricated for powerful persons. Compare the note of Lipsius on this passage.

Evander was a purely mythical personage, and merely performed the part of connecting the Arcadian town of Pallantium with the Palatine hill of Rome. His mother, the Arcadian nymph, Themis, or Nicostrata, was commuted into the native Italian oracular goddess, Carmentis; and public sacrifices were annually celebrated to both mother and son, at Rome, in the time of Dionysius.(63) He was, moreover (like Prometheus, Hercules, Orpheus, Janus, Saturn, and other fabulous beings), conceived under the light of a civilizer; and was described as having taught the use of letters, and of musical instruments, the sowing of corn, and the cultivation of the soil by oxen, as well as civil laws, and a humane mode of life, to the rude Italians.(64)

As the Arcadian origin of the Palatium did not rest on a historical basis, but was merely an invented story, other legends or etymologies, as was generally the case, were devised in order to perform the same service. Thus some derived the name from

---

(62) Dion. Hal. i. 32, 43. Festus, p. 220, speaks of the name Palatium being derived from its being the burial-place of Pallas. According to the Arcadian fables, Pallas was the son of Lycaon; Dion. Hal. i. 33; Paus. viii. 3, § 1. Concerning Pallas, see Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, p. 887.

(63) καὶ γὰρ Εὐάνδρῳ θυσίας ἔμαθον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἐπιτελουμένας ὅσα ἔτη δημοσίᾳ καὶ Καρμέντῃ, καθάπερ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἥρωσι καὶ δαίμοσι.—i. 32.

(64) See Dion. Hal. i. 33, and the passage of Livy cited above, n. 54. Tacit. Ann. xi. 14, says that the Aborigines learned letters from Evander the Arcadian. 'Primus itaque omnium Evander Italicos homines legere et scribere edocuit, litteris partim quas ipse antea didicerat: idemque fruges in Græciâ primum inventas ostendit, serentique usum edocuit, terræque excolendæ gratiâ primus boves in Italiâ junxit;' Scriptor de Orig. G. R. c. 5. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 351.

Concerning Hercules as a civilizer, see Dion. Hal. i. 41. Janus is represented in the same light by Plutarch, Num. 19, Quæst. Rom. 22; Macrob. Sat. i. 9. Saturn assumes the same character in Virg. Æn. viii. 319-25; Macrob. Sat. i. 7, 8; Justin. xliii. 1; Minuc. Fel. c. 22; Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 3.

Pallantia, a daughter of Evander; or from Palanto, the daughter of Hyperboreus, and the mother or wife of Latinus;(65) others explained it by a colony of Aborigines from a place named Palatium, in the district of Reate; others traced it to the *bleating* or the *wandering* of sheep (*balare* or *palare*).(66) All these explanations are inconsistent with each other; and consequently those last mentioned assume the nullity of the Arcadian legend of Evander.

The connexion between Arcadia and Rome likewise furnishes Dionysius with other supports of his favourite doctrine respecting the Hellenic origin of the Roman people. Hence he explains the cave Lupercal, and the festival of Lupercalia by the Arcadian Pan, the Lycæan deity;(67) he identifies the Consualia with an

---

(65) Respecting Palanto and Pallantia, see Klausen, ib. p. 889, 894.

(66) Servius Æn. viii. 51; Varro, de L.L. v. § 53; Festus, p. 220. Nævius is reported by Varro to have used the form *Balatium* from *balo*; compare Becker, vol. i. p. 416.

(67) i. 32, in c. 79 the explanation of the name Lupercal is interpolated by Dionysius himself. The words τὸ μὲν οὖν ἄλσος down to λέγεται are not a part of the narrative of Fabius; see above, p. 238. Virgil gives the same origin for Lupercal: for he introduces Evander as thus explaining the places to Æneas:

> Hinc lucum ingentem, quem Romulus acer Asylum
> Rettulit, et gelidâ monstrat sub rupe Lupercal,
> Parrhasio dictum Panos de more Lycæi.
>
> Æn. viii. 342—4.

Ovid gives the Arcadian explanation for the Lupercalia, Fast. ii. 279—82, 423—4; also Livy, i. 5. But he mixes native and foreign αἴτια:

> 'Adde peregrinæ causam, mea musa, Latinam.'—v. 359.

The native, and perhaps the popular explanation traced the name of Lupercal to the wolf of Romulus. (ib. 381—422.) Plut. Rom. ib.; Hartung, Religion der Römer, vol. ii. p. 177, considers the Arcadian explanation of Lupercalia as recent and unauthorized. See also Schwegler, p. 354-64.

The Schol. Plat. Phædr. p. 6, ed. Bekker, says, enumerating the ten Sibyls: τετάρτη Ἰταλική, ἡ ἐν ἐρημίᾳ τῆς Ἰταλίας τὴν διατριβὴν λαχοῦσα· ἧς υἱὸς ἐγένετο Εὔανδρος ὁ τὸ ἐν Ῥώμῃ τοῦ Πανὸς ἱερὸν τὸ καλούμενον Λούπερκον κτίσας· περὶ ἧς ἔγραψεν Ἐρατοσθένης. The prophetic mother of Evander is here converted into a Sibyl. According to Ælius Tubero, Remus was taken by the herdsmen of Numitor, when he and his companions were celebrating the Lupercalia, according to the institution of Evander, in a state of nudity. Dion. Hal. 180. The rites of the Lupercalia, and the names Fabii and Quinctilii, were also traced to Romulus and Remus. Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 22. The antique festival of Lupercalia maintained its ground at Rome even under the Christian Emperors, and was only extirpated by Pope Gelasius, at the end of the fifth century. Gibbon, Dec. and Fall, c. 36.

Arcadian festival of Hippocrata;(68) and he traces many religious ceremonies, which were, he says, celebrated at Rome, even in his own time, to Arcadian founders. For these, as for the name Palatium, there were other concurrent legends, assuming different origins, but all equally baseless.

§ 5 Dionysius continues his narrative by informing us, that a few years after the Arcadian colony, another Hellenic settlement was established in Italy. Hercules was returning to Greece from a military expedition in the west, and when he had reached Italy, some of his army wished to be released from their service. There were some Peloponnesians, men of Phenea and Epeans of Elis, whose country had been ravaged in the war against Hercules, together with some Trojans, whom Hercules had taken prisoners in the war with Laomedon.(69) This portion of the army of Hercules having received their dismissal,(70) took possession of a hill near the Palatine settlement of Evander, then called Saturnius; but which afterwards received the name of the Capitoline hill.(71) Some of the Eleans, it is said, were attracted by the resemblance of the name Saturnius to Κρόνιον, a mountain in their own country.(72)

---

(68) Dion. Hal. ii, 31, forgets his own explanation in i. 32, and dates the beginning of the Consualia from the rape of the Sabine women, in the reign of Romulus. Livy, i. 9, gives the same account; compare Plut. Rom. 14. Dionysius states that the god Consus, to whom this festival was dedicated, corresponds with Ποσειδῶν σεισίχθων. Festus, p. 41, says that the Consualia was a festival celebrated in honour of Consus, the god of counsel. Compare Varro, L.L. vi. 20; and see Hartung, vol. ii. p. 86.

(69) On the capture of Troy by Hercules, see Grote, vol. i. p. 389; Uschold, Geschichte des Trojanischen Krieges, p. 42.

(70) Dionysius thinks that other parts of the army of Hercules, may, on account of the fatigues of the campaign, have obtained permission to remain in Italy. *δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου στρατοῦ πᾶν, εἴ τι καματηρὸν ἢ τῇ πλάνῃ ἀχθόμενον ἦν, ἄφεσιν τῆς στρατείας αἰτησάμενον, ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ τῷδε ὑπομεῖναι.*—i. 34.

(71) As to the origin of the name Capitolium, see Becker, vol. i. p. 392. Schwegler, vol. i. p. 213, 793. According to Varro, L.L. v. 41-2. the Capitoline hill was first called Mons Saturnius, and afterwards Mons Tarpeius. See also Festus in Saturnia, p. 322; Justin, xliii. 1.

Capitolium probably means 'the height,' the elevated ground, equivalent to the Celtic Pen—as being the original citadel of Rome, and the place where the steep Tarpeian rock stood.

> In summo custos Tarpeiæ Manlius arcis
> Stabat pro templo, et *Capitolia celsa* tenebat.
>
> Æn. viii. 652—3.

There were, says Dionysius, two versions of the story respecting the passage of Hercules through Italy; one was fabulous and legendary, the other had a greater aspect of truth, and was adopted by those who narrated the exploits of Hercules in a historical form. The fabulous story was, that Hercules having been ordered by Eurystheus, among his other labours, to bring the oxen of Geryones from Erythea to Argos, had reached Italy, and was near the Palatine hill, when a robber named Cacus drove away some of the oxen, and hid them in his cave. Hercules detected the theft by the lowing of the cattle, and killed Cacus with his club.(73) In memory of the benefit conferred on the district by the slaughter of Cacus, divine honours were offered to Hercules; an altar was erected to him, called the *Ara Maxima*, which stood in later times near the Forum Boarium at Rome, and was reputed to be of peculiar sanctity; Grecian rites were instituted for its celebration; and two families, the Potitii and the Pinarii, were appointed to preserve them unchanged, by a faithful tradition.(74)

The more historical version, and that preferred by Dionysius, is, that Hercules was a great military commander, and that, at the head of a large army, he traversed the western parts of Europe, redressing wrongs, dethroning tyrants, preventing international oppression, introducing mild and humane customs, confining rivers within their banks, cutting roads over impassable mountains, and building cities in uninhabited regions;(75) in short, performing on a large scale, and with the aid of an army, functions similar in their spirit and tendency to those performed by knights-errant, in the romances of chivalry. This, as Dionysius remarks, is much more probable than that he came single-handed, driving a herd of oxen; for Italy was not on the road from Iberia to Argos; whereas, if he came on an expedition of beneficent conquest, his presence there is easily explained. He was naturally detained some time in Italy, for not only was his fleet kept at a distance by adverse winds, but some of the Italian tribes resisted his dominion. One of the wildest of these was governed by a savage prince named Cacus, who carried off some of the cattle of the invading army, and lodged them in a hill-fort; but he was afterwards besieged by Hercules, his citadel taken, and himself slain. In order to secure his conquests, Hercules left behind him the foreign troops, as a garrison, who have been already mentioned as forming a settlement on the site of the future Rome.(76) Having made these arrangements, he joined his fleet, which had arrived from Iberia, on the western coast, near the modern Naples: here he founded the city of Herculaneum, and sailed away to Sicily.(77)

---

(72) Dion. Hal. i. 34-5; compare Paus. vi. 20, § 1, concerning this mountain.

(73) An account of the slaughter of Cacus, with the supernatural, marvellous, and poetical incidents, is given in Virgil, Æn. viii. 184—279, and Ovid, Fast. i. 543—82. The version, which Dionysius calls mythical, is carefully stripped of all its supernatural circumstances. It is fabulous, because the expedition of Hercules to drive oxen from the far West, in order to please Eurystheus, is an improbable event, not because it contravenes the order of nature.

(74) Dion. Hal. i. 39—40. Concerning Cacus, see Klausen. Æneas und die Penaten, p. 768; and for the relations of Evander and Hercules, ib. p. 890. Schwegler, vol. i. p. 374, remarks that the quantity of the name Cacus shows that it has no affinity with the Greek κακός. The first syllable is probably contracted from some longer form.

The story of Hercules driving the oxen of Geryones belongs to the Greek mythology; and is as fictitious and imaginary as the story of the Lernæan hydra, the stag of Erymanthus, or the dragging of Cerberus from Hades.(78) What Dionysius calls the true historical account is a prosaic and rationalized narrative, framed upon the same principles as the account of the Trojan war in the preface of Thucydides; and resembling the plausible descriptions of the expeditions of Jason, and of Bacchus, which the later school of Greek writers on mythology concocted.(79) The original fabulous legend of Geryones is related in the Theogony of Hesiod, and at length in Apollodorus.(80) Erythea was a purely imaginary island, like Phæacia, Ogygia, and Æolia, in the Odyssey:(81) and according to the fable, Hercules transported the oxen of Geryones from Erythea to Tartessus over the sea, in a golden cup given him by the sun. Diodorus,(82) like Dionysius, rationalizes this adventure of Hercules, and describes it under the form of a military expedition.(83)

---

(75) Compare the account of the expedition of Hercules against Geryones, in Diodorus, who describes Hercules, at the head of a large army, as destroying the wild beasts in Northern Africa, which impeded the cultivation of the country; and as rendering the cities prosperous, by the extermination of lawless offenders or oppressive rulers; iv. 17. He is likewise described as having made a road over the Alps, passable for armies and beasts of burden, on his return from Spain. ib. c. 19. A Heraclean road in Italy, extending from the southern extremity to the district inhabited by the Celts and Iberians in the north, is mentioned in Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. 85. Hercules left many memorials of himself in Italy; ib. 97.

(76) Dion. Hal. i. 41-2.

(77) Dion. Hal. i. 44.

(78) Strabo, iii. 2, § 13, classes the expedition of Hercules for the oxen of Geryones with poetical fables, such as his expedition in search of the golden apples of the Hesperides, and the Island of the Blest.

---

(79) Speaking of the Argonautic expedition, and of its purely fabulous character, Mr. Grote says: 'Strabo, though he can neither overlook nor explain the geographical impossibilities of the narrative, supposes himself to have discovered the basis of actual fact, which the original poets had embellished or exaggerated: the golden fleece was typical of the great wealth of Colchis, arising from gold-dust washed down by the rivers; and the voyage of Jason was in reality *an expedition at the head of a considerable army*, with which he plundered this wealthy country, and made extensive conquests in the interior.' Hist. of Gr. vol. i. p. 347. See Strab. i. 2, § 39; xi. 2, § 18, where the military expedition of Jason is mentioned; also Justin, xlii. 2; Diod. iv. 40-1.

(80) Hesiod, Theog. 287—94; Apollod. ii. 5, § 10. Joann. Pediasimus de Herc. Lab. c. 10, ed. Westermann. Concerning Erythea and the cup of the sun, see Stesichor. Fragm. 5—7. Mimnerm. Frag. 13, ed. Schneidewin.

(81) When the geographical knowledge of the Greeks was extended, attempts were made to identify Erythea with some real place; as to which, see Ukert, Geogr. der Gr. und Röm. vol. ii. part 1, p. 240. Comp. Herod. iv. 8; Strab. iii. 2, § 11; ib. 5, § 4. It was generally placed at or near Cadiz. Scylax, however, states that Erythea was a plain in Illyria, and that Geryones here kept his oxen; c. 26. Hecatæus says that Hercules did not drive the oxen from Erythea, an island in the great ocean; but that Geryones was king of the mainland near Ambracia and Amphilochi, and that Hercules drove the oxen from this country, which was itself no slight labour; fr. 349, ed. Didot. This is a rationalizing explanation, for the purpose of obviating the difficulty of the cattle being driven from an island. A story of an apocryphal inscription, and of an attempt to identify Erythea, and the expedition of Hercules against Geryones, with a place in the territory of the Ænianes, at Hypata, at the foot of Mount Œta, is given in Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 133, where it is also mentioned that there was no place in Libya or Iberia called Erythea.

(82) Diod. iv. 17—24; v. 17—24.

(83) The military expedition of Hercules is likewise mentioned, in general terms, by Strabo, iii. 2, § 13. Compare Justin, xlii. 3.

According to his account, Hercules sets out from Crete at the head of a large army, crosses into Africa, and marches along the coast until he reaches the Straits of Gibraltar. By this passage he penetrates into Spain, and defeats the three sons of Chrysaor, who commanded three separate armies, killing them in single combat.(84) After his victory, he drives away the celebrated herds of cattle; but in his passage through the country he gives a portion of them to a just and pious king, from whom he had received honour: this prince dedicated them to Hercules, and the sacred herds still existed in Spain at the time of Diodorus. From Spain he marches through southern Gaul, over the Alps, into Italy; thus anticipating, by about six centuries, the expedition of Hannibal.(85) Here he visits the district of the Tiber, and is hospitably received by Cacius and Pinarius;(86) he also founds some sacred rites on the Palatine hill; but Diodorus knows nothing of the story of Evander, or of the monster Cacus.(87) Hercules next proceeds to southern Italy; swims across the Straits of Messina to Sicily with the oxen; afterwards returns, visits Croton, and then crosses to Epirus.(88)

---

(84) This is a rationalized form of the triple Geryones, the son of Chrysaor: *τρισώματος Γηρύων*, Æsch. Agam. 870. Hercules was supposed to have opened, or closed, the Straits of Gibraltar, Diod. iv. 18. Compare Herodor. Fragm. 20-1; vol. ii. p. 34, ed. Didot.

(85) The daughter of a Celtic prince, distinguished for her size and beauty, had disdained all native suitors, but when Hercules was passing through Celtica, in his expedition against Geryones, she admired his courage and strength, and bore to him a son, named Galates, from whom the people were called Galatæ. Diod. v. 24. Compare a similar story of the Scythians, in Herod. iv. 9. The two are combined in Parthen. 30.

(86) Diod. iv. 21, says: *τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπομνήματα μέχρι τῶνδε τῶν καιρῶν διαμένει κατὰ τὴν Ῥώμην.* These memorials are the Scalæ Caci, as well as the Atrium Caci, on the Palatine hill: see above, p. 240.

(87) According to Justin, xlii. 3, the Albani of Asia Minor, in the district of the Caucasus, derived their origin from some natives of the Alban mount, near the Tiber, who followed Hercules to Asia from Italy, when he was driving the oxen of Geryon. This origin was recognised by the Albani, when the army of Pompey was in that country during the Mithridatic war. Compare Dio Cass. xxxvi. 37; xxxvii. 1—3.

(88) There was a temenos of the hero Geryones at Agyrina in Sicily, where he was still honoured in the time of Diodorus; iv. 24. Hercules killed Lacinius for stealing one of the oxen, ib. He passed through Dyrrachium on his return from Erythea, Appian; Bell. Civ. ii. 39. Other

The main object of the Roman legends about Hercules and Cacus was to explain the origin of the ancient and sacred *ara maxima*, as well as the peculiar functions of the two ancient families of Potitii and Pinarii, which were connected with its celebrations. These two families performed the rites of Hercules about the ara maxima, but the former were admitted to the feast, while the latter were only allowed to minister at the sacred solemnity; or, according to another version, the Potitii alone regaled on the entrails of the ox (which, it seems, were considered the chief delicacy),(89) whereas the Pinarii were limited to the other parts of the animal. Fabulous legends connected with the origin of the rites performed by these two families are preserved by the Roman writers.(90) Appius the Censor induced the Potitii to transfer the performance of their hereditary rites to public slaves; whereupon the twelve families of the Potitian gens, containing thirty adults, died within the year, according to one account;(91) according to another,(92) all the members of the Potitian family, being twelve in number, died within thirty days.(93)

---

rationalized versions of the fable of Geryon may be seen in Palæphatus de Incred. c. 25, and Servius, Æn. vii. 662. The latter says: 'Fingitur ad eum ollâ æreâ transvectus, quod habuit navem fortem et ære munitam.' An account of Ino taking the infant Bacchus to Italy, and finding the Arcadian colony of Evander and Hercules on his return from Spain, is given by Ovid, Fast. vi. 493—528. She is received by Carmentis, v. 523.

(89) Compare Babr. Fab. 34.

(90) See Livy, i. 7; Dion. Hal. i. 40; Macrob. Sat. iii. 6; Virgil, Æn. viii. 269-72, 281; Servius, Æn. viii. 269. Festus in Potitium, p. 237; Plut. Quæst. Rom. 60; Script. de Orig. G. R. 6—8; Solin. i. § 10; Ovid, Fast. i. 543—582; Tacit. Ann. xv. 41. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 476. Below, ch. xiii. § 38.

(91) Livy, ix. 29.

(92) Festus, ib. Compare Buttmann, Mythologus, vol. ii. p. 294—7, who truly remarks that it is 'ein Mythos von den tausenden, die einen bestehenden Gebrauch, dessen Ursprung verdunkelt ist, poetisch begründen.' Buttmann's own conjecture respecting the origin of the names Potitii and Pinarii is however equally groundless.

Plutarch has a wholly different origin for the Pinarii from that which connects them with the institution of the rites of Hercules; and which explains their name, as alluding to their exclusion from the sacrificial feast, by the Greek πεινᾷν. He derives the Pinarii from Pinus, one of the four sons of Numa: Num. 21. Concerning the four sons of Numa, see Dion. Hal. ii. ad fin.

(93) Silius, vi. 627—36, has a genealogical legend of the Fabian family, which he traces to Hercules, and the daughter of Evander. Plutarch,

§ 6 Such is a fair, and indeed a favourable sample of the materials for an account of the early ethnology of Italy; such is a portion of the heap of chaff out of which the modern critical historian attempts to extract a few grains of truth. Dionysius had access to all that antiquity knew on the subject: he was master of the Greek and Latin languages: and was a learned, industrious student; moreover, nothing respecting the primitive state of Italy, which was recorded after his time, could be of any value. He was able to consult the entire series of early Roman historians, from Fabius Pictor down to his own time, including the Origines of Cato; all of which have perished. He was therefore placed in a more advantageous position than any modern, for ascertaining the truth respecting these primitive national movements; and yet we see the result. Throughout the whole of his narrative of the migrations of nations, from the supposed arrival of the Aborigines to the Greek colony under Hercules, there is not a single circumstance which has any title to be considered as historical. In the entire series of events, there is not a single point, either a name, a date, or a fact, determined by contemporary testimony, or even by an oral tradition traceable to any definite source. In this respect, Dionysius and Livy were in the same position as ourselves. They had no trustworthy evidence with respect to events alleged to have taken place centuries before the foundation of Rome. Nothing was known with respect to this primitive period. It was a world, not of recorded realities, but of imagination and fiction. All that belonged to it was mythology, either in its original or its transmuted state. The stories which professed to narrate its history were either popular legends, in their primitive form, full of marvels, improbabilities, and inconsistencies, and wholly unattested by credible witnesses; or they were modern versions of these legends, equally destitute of external

---

Fab. i. says that Fabius, the progenitor of the house, was the son of Hercules and a nymph, or a native woman, whom he met near the river Tiber. The derivation of the Fabian house from Hercules was a recognised legend: see Ruperti ad Sil. ii. 2.

evidence, but reduced to the dimensions of nature and probability, and dressed up in a historical garb by men of cultivated and philosophical minds.

The method adopted by the rationalizing mythologists of antiquity—such a process, for example, as that by which Hercules with the oxen of Geryon is converted into a general at the head of a great army—by which Cacus, the ogre, and cattle stealer, is turned into a petty tyrant, and his cave into a hill fort(94)— is treated with contempt by the modern critical historian. His contempt is just; but the process by which he extracts ethnological facts from legendary stories—and sees, for instance, a migration of Siceli in the alleged flight of a certain Sicelus—is only another form of the same historical method, and leads to results not more certain.

When the earliest of the Greek and Roman historians began to collect their accounts of these remote times—times which preceded their own by many centuries—all memory of the events had perished, and no authentic oral traditions were in existence. Hence the stories respecting them which have descended to us are devoid of historical substance: they are mere shifting clouds of mythology, which may at a distance deceive the mariner by the appearance of solid land, but disappear as he approaches and examines them by a close view.(95) However credible a witness an historian may be with respect to the events of his own time, his accounts of a bygone age, whose history had not been preserved, are necessarily unworthy of belief. Thus the account given by Thucydides of the Siceli having crossed into Sicily 300 years before the foundation of Naxos, that is, more than 550 years before his own birth; and of the Sicani having been, at a still earlier time, driven into Sicily by the Ligyes, from the river Sicanus in Iberia,(96) may be safely placed among unauthenticated legends, because there was no channel by which a contemporary record of such events could have reached him. They may be placed on a level with his amended version of the Trojan war; with his assumption of the residence of the Phæacians in Corcyra;(97) with his adoption of the fable of Tereus and Procne;(98) with his reference of Charybdis, the Cyclopes, and the Læstrygones, to the Straits of Messina and Sicily;(99) with his account of Hellen the son of Deucalion, and of the maritime ascendancy of Minos.(100) It is therefore unjust to censure an ancient writer for mistaking events of primitive history, and for neglecting to investigate the early ages with the same industry as he investigated the transactions of his own time.(101) For, in truth, no authentic records of that early period were in existence, and whatever diligence he might have used, he would never have arrived at any certain result.

---

(94) 'Silvestres homines sacer interpresque Deorum,
Cædibus et victu fœdo deterruit Orpheus,
Dictus ob hoc lenire tigres rabidosq. leones.'
Hor. Art. Poet. 391—3.

In these verses, Orpheus taming the wild beasts by his lyre, is converted into a civilizer of wild men, by a rationalizing interpretation which finds an allegory in the fable.

(95) 'How can a historian (says Niebuhr, in one of his early chapters) feel any interest in tracing the fantastic shapes assumed by the clouds of mythology, as they shift about at the whim of capricious narrators? who can bear to tarry among such things, when investigations of great importance are awaiting him?'—Hist. vol. i. p. 85. In a subsequent chapter he makes the following remarks, in reference to the story of Romulus and Remus. 'It belongs to anything but history. Its essence is the marvellous. We may strip this of its peculiarities, and pare away and alter, until it is reduced to a possible everyday occurrence: but we ought to be fully convinced, that the caput mortuum which will remain will be anything but a historical fact. Mythological tales of this sort are misty

---

shapes, often no more than a Fata Morgana, the prototype of which is invisible, the law of its refraction unknown; and even were it not so, it would still surpass the power of reflection, to proceed so subtly and skilfully, as to divine the unknown original from these strangely blended forms.'—ib. p. 222.

(96) vi. 2. (97) i. 25. (98) ii. 29.

(99) iv. 24; vi. 2. Compare Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. i. p. 540—6, where these and other instances of fabulous stories treated as historical by Thucydides are collected and commented upon. Klausen, ubi sup. p. 479, remarks that the report of Thucydides respecting the settlement of the Elymi in Sicily (vi. 2) is of no value, and is not more entitled to credit than his accounts of other mythical subjects. See Grote, vol. i. p. 424.

(100) i. 3 and 4. Euripides makes Hellen the son, not of Deucalion, but of Jupiter. Melanipp. Sap. Fragm. i. Dindorf; Æol. Fragm. i. Compare Apollod. i. 7, § 2. on this double parentage. Hellen likewise underwent the process of duplication, like so many other mythical personages, and was called the son of Phthius: See Clinton, F. H. vol. i. p. 18. Steph. Byz. in 'Ελλάς.

(101) See above, p. 130.

If Dionysius and Livy and the other ancient historians had no authentic materials for the primitive ethnology, and the early national movements of Italy, still less can the modern inquirer hope to arrive at any safe conclusions on this subject; or by any combinations or conjectures, however ingenious, to supply the defect of credible testimony and positive matter of fact. Hence all the investigations into the Italian nations, before the commencements of Roman history, may be regarded as equally unfounded, and therefore equally worthless. All the elaborate researches of modern scholars respecting the primitive history of the Pelasgians, the Siceli, the Tyrrhenians, the Etruscans, the Aborigines, the Latins, and other national races, must be considered as not less unreal than the speculations concerning judicial astrology, or the discovery of the philosopher's stone and the elixir of life. Not only the results of the uncritical Italian historians—such as Micali—but those arrived at by the most learned and sagacious of the German inquirers—as Niebuhr(102) and Otfried Müller(103)—must be rejected, when they relate to this unknown and undiscoverable period.

---

(102) Niebuhr seems to have derived little satisfaction from his elaborate researches into the early Italian ethnology (vol. i. p. 6—178), and to have attached little importance to the results at which he had arrived, for he begins the next chapter as follows: 'I now turn with pleasure towards my proper mark, from the wearisome task of gleaning *detached and mostly unimportant hints* concerning the Italian nations: and I retire from the seductive impulse to divine the nature of things *gone by and forgotten*, by a continually renewed examination of these *often uncertain* fragments.'—ib. p. 179. The obscurity and inconsistency of Niebuhr's conclusions respecting the Pelasgians, are pointed out by Mr. Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i. p. 97.

(103) For example, the whole of the early part of the chronological table in Müller's Etrusker, vol. i. p. 201, must be regarded as unattested by credible evidence.

CHAPTER IX.

ÆNEAS IN ITALY.

§ 1 ACCORDING to the view of those who conceived the Aborigines as the primitive and indigenous inhabitants of Latium, there was a line of four kings of the Aborigines, beginning with Saturn. He is succeeded by Picus and Faunus, and the series terminates with Latinus,(1) who is king of the Aborigines at the time when Æneas, a fugitive from Troy, accompanied by a party of Trojans, lands on the western coast of Italy.(2) This event is placed in the second generation, about fifty-five years after the departure of Hercules from Italy, and in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of King Latinus.(3)

---

(1) Æn. vii. 45—8. See Heyne, Exc. v.; compare Augustin. Civ. Dei. xviii. 15.

(2) According to Appian, H. R. i. 1, Faunus, son of Mars, was king of the Aborigines when Æneas landed in Italy.

(3) Dion. Hal. i. 44. The Aborigines began to be called Latins in the time of King Latinus, who ruled at the time of the Trojan war; ib. c. 9, and 60. Latinus is king of the Aborigines, according to Cato's Origins, p. 100, Krause; and Livy, i. 1. Æneas came to the Aborigines, who inhabited the country where Rome was afterwards built, Latinus, the son of Faunus, being then their ruler, according to Zonaras, vii. 1.

The Arcadian settlement in Latium was about sixty years before the Trojan war, during the reign of Faunus. Dion. Hal. i. 31; Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 5.

Latinus had reigned thirty-five years—about fifty-five years after the departure of Hercules—when Æneas landed in Latium; ib. i. 44. Dio Cassius, Fragm. iv. 4. Latinus was king at the time of the Trojan war. Dion. Hal. i. 9. Latinus died in the fourth year after the taking of Troy, in the first year after the landing of Æneas, ib. i. 64. According to Eusebius, Chron. p. 270, 311, ed. Mai, Janus, Saturn, Picus, Faunus, and Latinus, primitive kings of Italy, before the time of Æneas, reigned about 150 years. According to Syncellus, vol. i. p. 322—3, ed. Bonn., Albanus, son of Saturn, was the first King of Italy. Picus the son of Saturn (or Jupiter), reigned at Laurentum thirty-seven years, and Faunus, the son of Picus, forty-four years. In the time of Faunus, Hercules, returning from Spain, erected an altar in the Forum Boarium, as a memorial of the slaughter of Cacus, the son of Vulcan [read Κάκον for Κάκος]. According to some, Hercules reigned thirty-six years after Faunus. Latinus reigned thirty-six years: in his thirty-third year Æneas came from Troy, and married Lavinia. Another account is given, ib. p. 450.

The arrangement of the kings of the Aborigines in a genealogical line is quite arbitrary; nor are the accounts of the parentage of each consistent with one another. Saturn, the ultimate point in the series, is supposed to be immortal,(4) but Picus, whom Virgil and Ovid call the son of Saturn,(5) is a native Italian deity(6), and he can only be converted into a king by the system of Euhemerus, which discovered ancient legislators and rulers in the gods of Greece. Picus is described by the poets as having been metamorphosed by Circe, out of jealousy, into a woodpecker(7), with which sacred bird his name was connected. Faunus, again, who is represented as the son and successor of Picus(8), is a native Italian god; and indeed the Fauns were a class of rural deities, similar to the Greek satyrs. His being is essentially supernatural, and the attempt to convert him into a king is merely the rationalizing interpretation of a literary age.(9)

---

(4) Primus ab ætherio venit Saturnus Olympo,
Arma Jovis fugiens, et regnis exul ademtis.
Æn. viii. 319—20.

But according to the account in Macrob. Sat. i. 7, Janus is the most ancient king of Italy; he gives a hospitable reception to Saturn, who, in return, teaches him the arts of civilization; compare c. 9.

(5) Rex arva Latinus et urbes
Jam senior longâ placidas in pace regebat.
Hunc Fauno et nymphâ genitum Laurente Maricâ
Accipimus; Fauno Picus pater; isque parentem
Te, Saturne, refert; tu sanguinis ultimus auctor.
Æn. vii. 45-9.

Picus in Ausoniis, proles Saturnia, terris
Rex fuit, utilium bello studiosus equorum.
Ovid, Met. xiv. 320-1.

Virgil, Æn. vii. 189, calls Picus 'equûm domitor.' His ancient palace is described, ib. 170—6. Others made Sterces or Stercutius the father of Picus. Augustin. ubi sup.

(6) The superhuman and mythical character of Picus is clearly shown in the singular story in Ovid, Fast. iii. 285—348.

Sed poterunt ritum Picus Faunusque piandi
Tradere. Romani numen uterque soli.
v. 291-2.

(7) Ovid, Met. xiv. 320—96; Virg., Æn. vii. 189—91.

(8) See Æn. vii. ubi sup. He reigned 'tertio loco' after Saturn according to Justin, xliii. 1, which expression seems to imply *two* intermediate kings. Compare above, p. 298.

(9) On the analogy between Faunus and Pan, see Klausen, Æneas, p. 1141. According to Dion. Hal. i. 31, Faunus is the descendant of Mars; according to Appian, Hist. Rom. i. 1, he is the son of Mars. This genealogy differs from that of Virgil, who makes him the son of Picus.

Dionysius describes Faunus as having been king of the Aborigines when Evander came to Latium.(10)

Latinus was originally the eponymous representative of the Latins. He is mentioned in the ancient Theogony of Hesiod as being, with Agrius, the progeny of Ulysses and Circe, and as ruling over the Tyrrhenians in the recesses of the sacred islands.(11) But when the native deities of Italy were humanized, and placed on hereditary temporal thrones, Latinus was brought into connexion with them; and hence both Dionysius and Virgil designate Latinus as the son of Faunus.(12) Sometimes, however, the affinity is made less close: thus he is also described as the son of Hercules by a daughter of Faunus,(13) and again his mother, a Hyperborean woman, who bore him to Hercules, afterwards marries Faunus, who thus becomes his reputed father.(14)

§ 2 The fabulous line of kings of the Aborigines, terminating with King Latinus, is attached to the Roman history by the dynasty of Æneas, and the royal house of Alba Longa. According to the story usually received in antiquity, this renowned Trojan married the daughter of Latinus, and succeeded to his kingdom; thus establishing the connexion at the upper extremity of the chain; while at the lower, the continuity was formed by the descent of the founder of Rome from a daughter of an Alban prince. It becomes, therefore, necessary for us, in following the thread of the early Italian and Roman history, to examine the character of the accounts relating to this portion of its course. Some, indeed, of the historians anterior to Dionysius omitted all mention of Æneas;(15) as others suppressed the line of Alban kings and placed Æneas in immediate juxtaposition with Romulus.(16) The generally received version was, however, that which has been just described.

---

(10) Dion. Hal. i. 31. The Vitellii were said to be descended from Faunus, king of the Aborigines, and Vitellia, a native deity. Suet. Vitell. 1.

(11) Theog. 1011—6; compare Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 189; and Göttling ad loc.

(12) See Æn. vii. 45—9. In v. 213, Latinus is addressed by Ilioneus, as 'Rex, genus egregium Fauni.' Ovid, Met. xiv. 449, calls Latinus Faunigena. Dion. Hal. i. 43.

(13) Justin. ubi sup: 'Ex filiâ Fauni et Hercule, qui eodem tempore extincto Geryone armenta, victoriæ præmia, per Italiam ducebat, stupro conceptus Latinus procreatur.'

(14) Dion. Hal. i. 43.

(15) βούλομαι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς Αἰνείου παρουσίας εἰς Ἰταλίαν, ἐπεὶ τῶν συγγραφέων τοῖς μὲν ἠγνόηται, τοῖς δὲ διεφθόνηται ὁ περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγος, μὴ παρέργως

§ 3 The fictitious and legendary character of the accounts of the Trojan war, given to us by Homer, and other Greek poets and mythologists, has been generally recognised by modern critical inquirers, and has been clearly exhibited in the conclusive discussion of the subject by Mr. Grote, in his History of Greece.(17) We therefore start from the assumption that the whole cycle of legends relative to the war of Troy is unattested by authentic evidence, and lies beyond the limits of historical knowledge.

The legendary interest connected with the heroes who fought at Troy was not limited to their deeds of arms; it extended to their subsequent adventures after the termination of the ten years' siege, and the capture of the long-defended city. The *Nostoi*, or returns of the Greek chieftains from Troy, formed the subject of one of the early Epic poems;(18) and numerous legends, commemorating the foundation and colonial connexion of towns on the coasts of the Mediterranean, attested the cele-

---

διελθεῖν.—i. 45. ἔγραψα δὲ ταῦτα, καὶ τὴν παρέκβασιν ἐποιησάμην τοῦ ἀναγκαίου χάριν· ἐπειδὴ συγγραφέων οἱ μὲν οὐδ' ἐλθεῖν Αἰνείαν φασὶν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἅμα Τρωσίν, i. 53.

(16) See Sallust, Cat. 6. Agathyllus, an Elegiac poet of Arcadia, made Romulus the son of Æneas. Dion. Hal. i. 49. His age is unknown; see below ch. x. § 7.

(17) Vol. i. c. 15; compare Fuchs, de Varietate Fabularum Troicarum Quæstiones. Colon. 1830.

(18) See Düntzer, Fragmente der Epischen Poesie der Griechen, p. 23—4. Welcker, Epischer Cyclus, vol. i. p. 278: vol. ii. p. 281. It was called the Νόστοι of Agias of Troezen. Welcker considers it identical with the poem of the Ἀτρειδῶν κάθοδος, mentioned in Athen. vii. p. 281B. That the returns of the heroes from Troy formed one of the earliest subjects of the epic muse, we have the strongest reason for presuming; for a bard is described in the Odyssey as singing this subject to the suitors:

τοῖσι δ' ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός, οἱ δὲ σιωπῇ
εἵατ' ἀκούοντες. ὁ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἄειδεν
λυγρὸν, ὃν ἐκ Τροίης ἐπετείλατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.—Od. i. 325–7.

Compare likewise the remonstrance of Telemachus to his mother, with respect to the interest and novelty of the subject, ib. 350—5. The speech of Nestor, in Od. iii. 130—200, affords another detached example of this class of compositions. The anger of Minerva, as the cause of the misfortunes of the heroes upon their return, is again alluded to, v. 110; see Eurip. Troad. 65—97: Virg. Æn. i. 39. with Heyne's note, xi. 255—280.

brity of the supposed wanderings of these time-honoured heroes. Agamemnon, Menelaus, Ajax, and Neoptolemus met with various destinies when they returned to their respective homes, which exercised the invention of mythologists and poets; the Odyssey, however, which described the wanderings of Ulysses, was the great model for this class of fictitious adventures. Thucydides, following up his rationalist view of the Trojan war, represents the long absence of the Greeks at Troy, and their tardy return, as leading to civil dissensions in their own cities, which again led to colonization by the defeated party.(19) This mode of exhibiting the ancient legends however involves a complete departure from their original spirit: the settlements founded by the Grecian heroes, in their wanderings after the siege of Troy, were supposed to be due to their individual influence; they were conceived as wandering from place to place, and establishing new cities, as Hercules went about destroying monsters and wild animals. The conversion of these hero-created colonies into settlements made by a defeated political minority, which emigrated for safety, may be compared with the commutation of the feat of Hercules in driving away the oxen of Geryones, into a military expedition against Spain, of which we spoke in the preceding chapter.

The heroes whose adventures after the capture of Troy occupied the largest space in the Greek fictions, were naturally those of their own country, who could only reach their homes by crossing the sea. The Agamemnon of Æschylus belongs to this class of subjects.(20) A few, however, of the Trojans were supposed to emigrate westwards, after the ruin of their city, and to become founders of colonies. Thus Antenor, according to Pindar, came to Cyrene with Helen, when his native city had been burnt.(21) According to another story, preferred by the later and Roman writers, he penetrated as far as the country of the Heneti, at the extremity of the Adriatic sea, and founded the city of Patavium.(22) Helenus, likewise, the son of Priam and Hecuba, is supposed to have migrated to Epirus, and to have married Andromache after the death of Neoptolemus.(23)

---

(19) i. 12: *ἥτε γὰρ ἀναχώρησις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐξ Ἰλίου χρονία γενομένη πολλὰ ἐνεόχμωσε, καὶ στάσεις ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ὡς ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐγίγνοντο, ἀφ' ὧν ἐκπίπτοντες τὰς πόλεις ἔκτιζον.* Strabo takes a similar view of the consequences of the Trojan war. Speaking of Æneas and Antenor, and the others whose wanderings over the whole world after that war were celebrated, he remarks that both the Greeks and barbarians then lost their domestic possessions, as well as what they had acquired in the war; so that after the fall of Troy even the victors took to a life of piracy and plunder on account of their straitened circumstances; but especially those of the defeated party, who had survived the war. Numerous cities are said to have been founded by them along the whole coast beyond the limits of Greece, and even in some inland places; i. 3, § 2. According to Thuc. ii. 68, Amphilochian Argos was founded by Amphilochus, who, finding an unpleasant state of things at Argos, on his return from Troy, left his native city, and planted this new settlement.

Plato, Leg. iii. 4, says that when the Greeks returned from the siege of Troy to their respective homes, they were ill-received by the new generation which had grown up in their absence; the result of which was civil conflicts, followed by massacres and banishments.

§ 4 But among the Trojan heroes who migrated from Troy into distant regions, and associated their names with the foundation of cities, by far the most renowned was Æneas, the son of Anchises and Venus, and therefore the kinsman of Priam.(24) The mythical reminiscences of him along the coasts and islands of Greece from Thrace to Epirus, as well as in Italy and Sicily, are so numerous, that he fairly rivals any of the Greek heroes in ubiquity.(25) Homer represents him as destined to perpetuate the royal line of Tros, and to reign over a remnant of the Trojans, after the destruction of Troy.(26) This dominion was doubtless conceived by the poet as exercised in his own country;(27) but the ambiguity of the prediction admitted of its being applied to the reign of Æneas over a Trojan colony in a foreign land.(28) Everything which favoured the development of the legend of Æneas was eagerly seized, and moulded into a variety of forms,

---

(20) Concerning the wanderings of the Greek heroes, see Grote, ubi sup. p. 418—27; Fuchs, ubi sup. c. 19.

(21) Pyth. v. 19. He speaks of the Antenoridæ, in the plural number.

(22) Livy, i. 2; Strab. xiii. 1, § 53; Virg. Æn. i. 242—9; and Servius ad loc. Heyne, in his Excursus on this passage, has shown how the legend of the settlement of Antenor in Italy was elaborated by Roman writers: 'Avide commentum (he says) arripuere Romani scriptores, qui Antenorem cum Æneâ compararunt;' compare Fuchs, ubi sup. p. 155. Dictys represents Antenor as remaining in Troy; v. 17. Ægestus, or Acestes, and Elymus, the mythical founders of Segesta and Elyme in Sicily, were described as Trojans, but more generally connected with Laomedon, and placed before the Greek siege of Troy. See Heyne, Exc. i. ad Æn. v. Strabo, however, makes Elymus a companion of Æneas, xiii. i. § 53; compare Dion. Hal. i. 47.

Ocelas, a companion of Antenor who followed him to Italy, is said to have afterwards founded a town in Spain. Strab. iii. 4, § 3.

(23) See Æn. iii. 294—6, and Heyne, Exc. x.

(24) Æneas sets forth his genealogy in Iliad, xx. 215—40. Ilus and Assaracus are the sons of Tros. Laomedon is the son of Ilus, and Priam is the son of Laomedon. Capys is the son of Assaracus, and Anchises is the son of Capys. According to this imaginary pedigree, therefore, Priam and Anchises are second cousins. Compare Dion. Hal. i. 62. Concerning the pedigree of Æneas, see Heyne, Exc. xvii. ad Æn. ii. A pedigree attributed to Attius the tragic poet makes Priam and Anchises sons of Laomedon—but perhaps the passage is mutilated, and ought to be read 'Laomedon Priamum et (Capys) Anchisen edidit.' See Ribbeck, Trag. Lat. Rel. p. 188.

---

(25) Compare Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. i. p. 430.

(26) Iliad xx. 306—8. Jupiter is described in these verses as hating the line of Priam, which therefore becomes extinct. The Trojan dynasty is prolonged in Æneas, who is descended from Assaracus. Another form of the prophecy is given in the Homeric hymn to Venus, v. 197—200, where the name of *Αἰνείας* is derived from the *αἰνὸν ἄχος* of Venus at having yielded to the embraces of a mortal man. The old logographer Acusilaus, Fragm. 26, mentions the continued reign of Æneadæ over the Trojans. He describes it as recognised by an oracle, and brought about by the machinations of Venus. Compare Mure, Hist. of the Lang. and Lit. of Greece, vol. iv. p. 137.

(27) See Klausen, ubi sup. p. 41—5; Niebuhr, Hist. vol. 1, p. 1; Grote, vol. i. p. 428. Demetrius of Scepsis stated that his native town had been the royal residence of Æneas; Strabo xiii. 1, § 53.

(28) See Dion. Hal. i. 53, and Heyne ad Iliad. xx. 306. It is in this sense that the prophecy is applied by Virgil, who supposes it to be uttered by the oracle of Apollo at Delos:

> 'Dardanidæ duri, quæ vos a stirpe parentum
> Prima tulit tellus, eadem vos ubere læto
> Accipiet reduces. Antiquam exquirite matrem.
> Hic domus Æneæ cunctis dominabitur oris,
> Et nati natorum, et qui nascentur ab illis.'
>
> Æn. iii. 94—8.

In order to understand this passage, it is necessary to observe that Virgil supposes Dardanus, the primitive king of Troy, to be of Italian origin. See Æn. iii. 167, 503, and Heyne, Exc. vi. ad Æn. iii; also Dion. Hal. i. 61-2. This is one of the numerous modifications of legend, to which the growth of the Roman power gave rise. Strabo, after remarking that the verses in Homer imply that Æneas and his successors continued to reign *in Troy*, after the extinction of the line of Priam, proceeds to say that some persons altered the verse

> *νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει,*

into

> *νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο γένος πάντεσσιν ἀνάξει,*

in order that it might be applicable to the Romans, xiii. 1, § 53. We know, from Thuc. ii. 54, that liberties were taken with the text of prophecies, even when they did not occur in a poem. In like manner Tryphiodorus says that Jupiter approved of the escape of Æneas from Troy, in order that the descendants of Venus might enjoy imperishable when the connexion of the house of Æneas with the great Roman nation, and above all, when the descent of the Julian family from Iulus the son of Æneas had been firmly established in the popular belief. Besides this reason for propagating the legend, the accidental resemblance of proper names, and the existence of temples of Venus, likewise furnished motives for deriving the foundation of cities from the celebrated name of Æneas.

One of the various versions of the story of Æneas represented him as a traitor to his countrymen, in concert with Antenor, and as spared by the Greeks, in the sack of Troy, because he had secretly assisted them in effecting its capture.(29) When however the Homeric notion of his continuance in the Troad, as the founder of a royal line, had been set aside, and the story of his definitive flight from Troy was substituted, he seems to have been originally conceived as leaving the city with his father, wife,

---

power, v. 642—6. The belief in the continued reign of Æneas and his descendants at Troy, founded upon the verses in Homer, was so strong, that some writers supposed the hero who went to Italy, to have been a different Æneas from the son of Venus and Anchises, or Ascanius the son of Æneas: while others represented Æneas as sailing to Italy, leaving a detachment of his followers behind him, and returning to Troy. Dion. Hal. i. 53. All these were contrivances for reconciling the Homeric prophecy with the Italian colony. Lesches, the author of the Little Iliad, differed from Homer, for he described Neoptolemus as taking away Æneas as his allotted prisoner from Troy.

αὐτὸν τ' Ἀγχίσαο κλυτὸν γόνον ἱπποδάμοιο
Αἰνείαν ἐν νηυσὶν ἐβήσατο ποντοπόροισιν
ἐκ πάντων Δαναῶν ἄγεμεν γέρας ἔξοχον ἄλλων.
Ap. Tzetz. ad Lyc. 1263; Düntzer, p. 19.

There were other stories which described Æneas as having been buried in the city of Berecynthia, in the neighbourhood of Troy. 'Ait quidem Agathocles complures esse auctores, qui dicant Ænean sepultum in urbe Berecynthiâ proxime flumen Nolon, atque ex ejus progenie quendam nomine Rhomum venisse in Italiam, et urbem Romam nominatam condidisse.' Festus in Romam, p. 269. The passage is taken from the work of Agathocles concerning Cyzicus; the date of this writer is uncertain: Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 290.

(29) The treachery of Æneas is broadly stated in the passage of Menecrates of Xanthus, cited by Dion. Hal. i. 48. The age of Menecrates is indeterminate: he is referred by C. Müller to the period 336—247 B.C. Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 313. Dictys describes Æneas first as the accomplice of Antenor in betraying Troy to the Greeks, and afterwards as attempting to create an insurrection against Antenor, and to expel him from his throne. This design is discovered by Antenor; whereupon Æneas, with a body of men, leaves Troy, and founds a city in the island of Black Corcyra, in the Adriatic Sea, v. 1—17. See the note of Dederich, p. 477. Compare Fuchs, ubi sup. p. 140, 155; Grote, vol. i. p. 427.

and child, and escaping, by the aid of his divine mother, or of Mercury, through the flames, and the weapons of the enemy.(30) This is probably the account to which Dionysius alludes, when he says that some writers give a fabulous form to his escape.(31) The version to which he assigns the preference, as being the most worthy of belief, is, he declares, derived from the Troica of Hellanicus.(32) It is written in the rationalizing spirit of Dictys, and might almost seem to be a portion of his work. Æneas is described as first taking refuge in the citadel of Troy, which holds out for a time against the Greeks; and as afterwards escaping, with his father, and paternal gods, his wife and children, and other valuables, to the strongholds of Mount Ida. Here he makes a capitulation with the Greeks, who agree to allow him to depart from the country in safety, provided that he surrenders and child, and escaping, by the aid of his divine mother, or of Mercury, through the flames, and the weapons of the enemy.(30) This is probably the account to which Dionysius alludes, when he says that some writers give a fabulous form to his escape.(31) The version to which he assigns the preference, as being the most worthy of belief, is, he declares, derived from the Troica of Hellanicus.(32) It is written in the rationalizing spirit of Dictys, and might almost seem to be a portion of his work. Æneas is described as first taking refuge in the citadel of Troy, which holds out for a time against the Greeks; and as afterwards escaping, with his father, and paternal gods, his wife and children, and other valuables, to the strongholds of Mount Ida. Here he makes a capitulation with the Greeks, who agree to allow him to depart from the country in safety, provided that he surrenders the forts in his possession. His eldest son, Ascanius, is made by the inhabitants king of the territory of Dascylium, where the Ascanian lake is situated. Here he is joined by Scamandrius and others of the sons of Hector, who have been released from their captivity, in Greece, by Neoptolemus, and with them he returns to Troy. Æneas, however, taking with him his father, and his other children, and his family gods, sails to the isthmus of Pallene.(33)

---

(30) See the account in Quintus Smyrnæus, xiii. 300—32, which is probably imitated from the early Greek writers.

> Descendo, ac ducente deo flammam inter et hostes
> Expedior; dant tela locum, flammæque recedunt.—Æn. ii. 632-3.

In vi. 110-1, Æneas says of Anchises:

> Illum ego per flammas et mille sequentia tela,
> Eripui his humeris, medioque ex hoste recepi.

The escape of Æneas was conceived as effected by supernatural aid: thus Schol. Ver. ad Æn. ii. 717. 'Additur etiam a L. Cassio censorio, *miraculo* magis Ænean patris [servato-] rem inter hostes intactum properavisse.' Concerning this writer, see Krause, Vit. et Fragm. Hist. Rom. p. 155; also Prop. iv. 1, 14. Et verita est humeros urere flamma pios. Ovid. Fast. iv. 800. Pietas Æneia fecit, Innocuum victo cui dedit ignis iter. Other passages to the same purport are cited by Klausen, ubi sup. p. 161. Sophocles appears to have represented Æneas as escaping *before* the capture of the city: Dion. Hal. i. 48. This account is borrowed from the old Epic poem, the Ἰλίου Πέρσις, in which Æneas was described as alarmed by the prodigy of Laocoon, and escaping to Ida before the treachery of Sinon. Procl. Exc. The story about a sacred casket, in Paus. vii. 18, § 7, implies that the flight of Æneas from Troy was sudden. In the Tabula Iliaca, which purports to represent the version of Stesichorus, Æneas, carrying Anchises and the Penates, leading Ascanius, and followed by his wife, is conducted out of Troy by Mercury.

(31) *εἰσὶ δ' οἱ μυθωδεστέραν αὐτοῦ ποιοῦσι τὴν ἔξοδον.*—i. 48.

(32) i. 47-8. Other fragments of the same work are collected in Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. i. p. 61—5. It seems difficult to believe that a rationalized version of the departure of Æneas from Troy could have been written by the ancient Hellanicus, the predecessor of Thucydides. A passage in which the conflict of Achilles with the Scamander is treated in a similar spirit, is however cited from the same work, ib. Fragm. 132. If these passages are genuine, the method of reducing the Homeric account of the siege of Troy to the standard of common life, did not originate with Thucydides.

---

(30) See the account in Quintus Smyrnæus, xiii. 300—32, which is probably imitated from the early Greek writers.

> Descendo, ac ducente deo flammam inter et hostes
> Expedior; dant tela locum, flammæque recedunt.—Æn. ii. 632-3.

In vi. 110-1, Æneas says of Anchises:

> Illum ego per flammas et mille sequentia tela,
> Eripui his humeris, medioque ex hoste recepi.

The escape of Æneas was conceived as effected by supernatural aid: thus Schol. Ver. ad Æn. ii. 717. 'Additur etiam a L. Cassio censorio, *miraculo* magis Ænean patris [servato-] rem inter hostes intactum properavisse.' Concerning this writer, see Krause, Vit. et Fragm. Hist. Rom. p. 155; also Prop. iv. 1, 14. Et verita est humeros urere flamma pios. Ovid. Fast. iv. 800. Pietas Æneia fecit, Innocuum victo cui dedit ignis iter. Other passages to the same purport are cited by Klausen, ubi sup. p. 161. Sophocles appears to have represented Æneas as escaping *before* the capture of the city: Dion. Hal. i. 48. This account is borrowed from the old Epic poem, the Ἰλίου Πέρσις, in which Æneas was described as alarmed by the prodigy of Laocoon, and escaping to Ida before the treachery of Sinon. Procl. Exc. The story about a sacred casket, in Paus. vii. 18, § 7, implies that the flight of Æneas from Troy was sudden. In the Tabula Iliaca, which purports to represent the version of Stesichorus, Æneas, carrying Anchises and the Penates, leading Ascanius, and followed by his wife, is conducted out of Troy by Mercury.

(31) *εἰσὶ δ' οἱ μυθωδεστέραν αὐτοῦ ποιοῦσι τὴν ἔξοδον.*—i. 48.

(32) i. 47-8. Other fragments of the same work are collected in Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. i. p. 61—5. It seems difficult to believe that a rationalized version of the departure of Æneas from Troy could have been written by the ancient Hellanicus, the predecessor of Thucydides. A passage in which the conflict of Achilles with the Scamander is treated in a similar spirit, is however cited from the same work, ib. Fragm. 132. If these passages are genuine, the method of reducing the Homeric account of the siege of Troy to the standard of common life, did not originate with Thucydides.

§ 5 When once the migration of Æneas from Troy had been incorporated with the legends of the Trojan cycle, the desire of many Greek and Italian populations to trace the unknown or obscure origin of their town, or of some of its temples or public monuments, to a celebrated founder, led to a belief that Æneas had landed on their coast, and had left on it these memorials of his presence. The legends which thus arose were unconnected with each other, and took no account of the existence of similar legends elsewhere, with which they might or might not be consistent.(34) When however Æneas came to be introduced into history and described, by Dionysius and others, as founding a civilized colony in a barbarous land; or again, when he was made the subject of an epic poem, and his adventures were narrated by Virgil in a consecutive series; it was necessary to suppose him to touch successively at the places where a belief in his presence had been formed, and to combine them in a single voyage. The voyage was thus suggested by the etymological legends: the similarity of the name suggested the connexion with Æneas, which in the latter was strengthened by the presence of a temple of Venus in the neighbourhood. Euphorion however and Callimachus, great masters of antiquarian mythology, did not recognise the foundation of Ænus by Æneas; they derived the name from a companion of Ulysses who was buried there, and thus found an origin in another part of the Trojan cycle.

---

(33) The name for the wife of Æneas, adopted by Virgil, is Creusa. In the painting of Polygnotus at Delphi, Creusa was represented among the captive women; but apparently only as the daughter of Priam: Paus. x. 26, 1. Compare Apollod. iii. 12, 5. In the Cyprian Epic and in the poem of Lesches, the wife of Æneas was named Eurydice. Paus. ib. See Heyne, Exc. xiv. ad Æn. ii. Children of Æneas by Codone and Anthemone are mentioned by Agathyllus, ap. Dion. Hal. i. 49. On the variety of names for the children of Æneas, see Heyne. Exc. xvii. ad Æn. ii. The name of Anchises for the father of Æneas was fixed by the Iliad. Alceas, a historian of uncertain date, who wrote a work of Troica, related that Astyanax was expelled from his kingdom by Antenor, but was afterwards restored to it by Æneas, who brought him military assistance. Serv. ad Æn. ix. 264. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 278.

(34) See Strab. xiii. 1, § 53. where several places supposed to have been visited by Æneas are mentioned in the alternative, and not as forming a connected series.

After this visit to the shores of northern Greece, both Dionysius(41) and Virgil(42) carry him to the island of Delos, in the midst of the Ægean; according to Dionysius, it exhibited many marks of the presence of Æneas and the Trojans; probably an allusion to some fabulous relics or commemorative rites. Here Æneas is received by Anius, king and priest of Apollo; whose daughter, Launa, was reported to have accompanied Æneas to Italy, and given her name to the town of Lavinium.(43) After Delos, the courses of Dionysius and Virgil diverge for a portion of the way: Dionysius takes him direct to Cythera, in order that he may found the temple of Venus in that island;(44) and he derives Cinæthium, a small headland near Cape Tænarum, from a companion of Æneas who is buried there.(45) Two towns in the south-eastern promontory of Laconia are likewise traced to Æneas, viz. Etis, which is said to have been named from his daughter Etias, and Aphrodisias, whose name is a memorial of his divine mother.(46) Virgil, however, carries him by a more circuitous route to Crete, where he founds the town of Pergamum; but is forced by a pestilence to abandon the new settlement.(47) Here the resemblance of the name to that of the Trojan citadel suggested the connexion with Æneas. Another story however represented Agamemnon as its founder, and accounted for the name as a reminiscence of his victory over the Trojans.(48) After this short divergence, the courses both of Dionysius and Virgil coincide at Zacynthos. There was in this island, at the time of Dionysius, a temple of Æneas and Venus, with sacrifices and games; the course where the young men contended for prizes, was called the course of Æneas and Venus. These names and customs are considered by Dionysius as

---

(41) i. 50. (42) Æn. iii. 69—120.

(43) Dion. Hal. i. 59. Compare i. 43, where another story makes Launa the daughter of Evander. The daughter of Anius is said to have borne a son to Æneas: 'Alii dicunt hujus Anii filiam occulte ab Ænea stupratam edidisse filium nomine An[ium].'—Serv. Æn. iii. 80. Lutatius, cited by the writer de Orig. Gent. Rom. 9, says that Æneas married Lavinia the daughter of Anius, and that she gave her name to the *Lavinia littora*. Pherecydes, Fragm. 94, told a strange story of Anius, king of Delos, persuading the Greek armament on its way to Troy to remain nine years with him, because there was an oracle that Troy would be taken in the tenth year. He promised that they should be fed by his daughters. In the passage of Tzetzes, ad Lyc. 570, we must read either δεκάτῳ χρόνῳ or δεκάτῳ ἔτει. Compare Mure, Hist. of the Lit. of Gr. vol. iv. p. 190, note. The daughters of Anius were likewise mentioned by the author of the Cypria, Tzetz. ib. The received story respecting Anius was that he had three (or four) daughters, called the οἰνοτρόποι, who turned everything they touched into wine, corn, or oil: Tzetz. ib.; Steph. Byz. in Ἄνδρος: Hesych. in οἰνοτρόποι, Ovid. Met. xiii. 640–74. According to Ovid, they were metamorphosed into doves.

(44) The existence of this temple is testified by Thuc. vii. 26.

(45) Heyne, Exc. i. ad Æn. iii., thinks that the monument of Cinadus, the pilot of Ulysses, near the headland of Onugnathus, mentioned by Paus.,

---

ii. 22, § 10, is a confusion with Cinæthium and the companion of Æneas. But if the positions are correctly stated, one is on the promontory of Malea, the other on the promontory of Tænarum.

(46) Paus. iii. 22, § 11; viii. 12, § 8.

(47) Æn. iii. 121—91.

(48) At rex regum Agamemnon, tempestate in Cretam insulam rejectus, tres ibi urbes statuit, duas a patriæ nomine, unam a victoriæ memoriâ, Mycenas, Tegeam, Pergamum. Vell. i. 1. A different and more complicated narrative is reported by Servius: 'Alii dicunt, Pergamum in Cretâ conditam a Trojanis captivis, qui ex classe Agamemnonis illo erant delati, ibique putant Æneam quendam generis auctorem, Ilio incolumi, cum eo ad sacrum Apollinis venisse, et gravidam hospitis filiam fecisse, ex quâ ortus eodem nomine Æneas, classem Agamemnonis est aggressus hieme disjectam, cui se feruntur junxisse hi, qui Cretam secesserant deserto Agamemnone, unde loco nomen Pergamum ab illo conditum, quod obtinuisse desertores feruntur, juxta Cydoniam.'—ad Æn. iii. 133. According to this story, a certain Æneas migrated from Troy to Crete, before the siege by the Greeks. He had a son by a Cretan woman, also named Æneas; and this latter Æneas attacked the fleet of Agamemnon on his return from Troy: he was joined by Trojan deserters from the ships, and with them he founded Pergamum. The words *cum eo* have no antecedent, and either they are corrupt, or some name has fallen out. The construction of the words 'ab illo conditum' is also obscure. Compare Klausen, ubi sup. p. 356. Aristoxenus stated that the Cretans showed the tomb of Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver, at Pergamea, near the Strangers' road, Plut. Lycurg. 31; See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 282. Pergamum or Pergamea was near Cydonia, on the northern coast of Crete. See Hoeck's Kreta, vol. i. p. 24, 382; Pashley's Travels in Crete, vol. ii. p. 23—5.

in the south-eastern promontory of Laconia are likewise traced to Æneas, viz. Etis, which is said to have been named from his daughter Etias, and Aphrodisias, whose name is a memorial of his divine mother.(46) Virgil, however, carries him by a more circuitous route to Crete, where he founds the town of Pergamum; but is forced by a pestilence to abandon the new settlement.(47) Here the resemblance of the name to that of the Trojan citadel suggested the connexion with Æneas. Another story however represented Agamemnon as its founder, and accounted for the name as a reminiscence of his victory over the Trojans.(48) After this short divergence, the courses both of Dionysius and Virgil coincide at Zacynthos. There was in this island, at the time of Dionysius, a temple of Æneas and Venus, with sacrifices and games; the course where the young men contended for prizes, was called the course of Æneas and Venus. These names and customs are considered by Dionysius as

---

ii. 22, § 10, is a confusion with Cinæthium and the companion of Æneas. But if the positions are correctly stated, one is on the promontory of Malea, the other on the promontory of Tænarum.

(46) Paus. iii. 22, § 11; viii. 12, § 8.

(47) Æn. iii. 121—91.

(48) At rex regum Agamemnon, tempestate in Cretam insulam rejectus, tres ibi urbes statuit, duas a patriæ nomine, unam a victoriæ memoriâ, Mycenas, Tegeam, Pergamum. Vell. i. 1. A different and more complicated narrative is reported by Servius: 'Alii dicunt, Pergamum in Cretâ conditam a Trojanis captivis, qui ex classe Agamemnonis illo erant delati, ibique putant Æneam quendam generis auctorem, Ilio incolumi, cum eo ad sacrum Apollinis venisse, et gravidam hospitis filiam fecisse, ex quâ ortus eodem nomine Æneas, classem Agamemnonis est aggressus hieme disjectam, cui se feruntur junxisse hi, qui Cretam secesserant deserto Agamemnone, unde loco nomen Pergamum ab illo conditum, quod obtinuisse desertores feruntur, juxta Cydoniam.'—ad Æn. iii. 133. According to this story, a certain Æneas migrated from Troy to Crete, before the siege by the Greeks. He had a son by a Cretan woman, also named Æneas; and this latter Æneas attacked the fleet of Agamemnon on his return from Troy: he was joined by Trojan deserters from the ships, and with them he founded Pergamum. The words *cum eo* have no antecedent, and either they are corrupt, or some name has fallen out. The construction of the words 'ab illo conditum' is also obscure. Compare Klausen, ubi sup. p. 356. Aristoxenus stated that the Cretans showed the tomb of Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver, at Pergamea, near the Strangers' road, Plut. Lycurg. 31; See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 282. Pergamum or Pergamea was near Cydonia, on the northern coast of Crete. See Hoeck's Kreta, vol. i. p. 24, 382; Pashley's Travels in Crete, vol. ii. p. 23—5.

From Zacynthus, both Dionysius and Virgil represent Æneas as following his course northwards, to the island or peninsula of Leucas. Here was a temple of Venus Æneas, on a small island between the town of Leucas and the canal which had been dug through the sand. The foundation of this temple is of course ascribed to Æneas,(57) as well as a similar temple at Actium.(58) Some games at the latter place, celebrated by the natives to the Actian Apollo, and increased by Augustus Cæsar in commemoration of his victory, are likewise traced to the Trojan hero, the mythical progenitor of the Julian family.(59) Ambracia moreover contained its memorials of his presence — namely, a temple of Venus, and a heroum, with a small archaic wooden image of Æneas.(60)

From the Actian coast Virgil conveys Æneas direct by sea to Buthrotum. Dionysius assigns the same course to Anchises; but he describes Æneas, and the most active part of the army, as making a land journey to Dodona, in order to consult the oracle. Here they dedicate some brazen bowls, some of which were extant in the time of Dionysius, with the names of the dedicators;(61) being, doubtless, forgeries of late date, like the

---

of the Mantineans were, as Müller points out, celebrated. Athen. iv. p. 154b. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 136. See also Klausen, p. 337, 364.

(57) Dion. Hal. i. 50. The foundation of the celebrated temple of the Leucadian Apollo was ascribed to Æneas by Varro, Serv. ad Æn. iii. 279. Compare Klausen, ubi sup. p. 397. Ἀφροδίτη αἰνειάς is considered by Klausen as equivalent to *Venus placabilis;* the epithet being derived from *αἰνεῖν*, and having no connexion with Æneas; ib. p. 34. Concerning the canal by which the Leucadian peninsula was cut off from the mainland, see Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. iii. p. 539; Livy, xxxiii. 17.

(58) Dion. Hal. i. 50, who remarks that both the temple of Ἀφροδίτη Αἰνειὰς at Actium, and that of the great gods (similarly attributed to the foundation of Æneas), were extant in his time: ἃ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ νῦν.

(59) ἤγετο δὲ καὶ πρότερον τὰ Ἄκτια τῷ θεῷ, στεφανίτης ἀγὼν, ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων· νυνὶ δ' ἐντιμότερον ἐποίησεν ὁ Καῖσαρ—Strab. vii. 7, § 6; and see Dio Cass. li. 1. These games are duly celebrated by the courtly poet of Rome, Æn. iii. 278—82; Servius, ad v. 280. Julius Cæsar speaks of himself as descended from Æneas and Iulus, in Dio Cass. xli. 34. He dedicated a temple to Venus, as being the author of his family; ib. xliii. 22.

(60) Dion. Hal. i. 50; Klausen, ubi sup. p. 416.

(61) ὧν τινες ἔτι περίεισιν ἐπιγραφαῖς πάνυ ἀρχαίαις δηλοῦντες τοὺς ἀναθέντας. Dion. Hal. i. 51.

From Zacynthus, both Dionysius and Virgil represent Æneas as following his course northwards, to the island or peninsula of Leucas. Here was a temple of Venus Æneas, on a small island between the town of Leucas and the canal which had been dug through the sand. The foundation of this temple is of course ascribed to Æneas,(57) as well as a similar temple at Actium.(58) Some games at the latter place, celebrated by the natives to the Actian Apollo, and increased by Augustus Cæsar in commemoration of his victory, are likewise traced to the Trojan hero, the mythical progenitor of the Julian family.(59) Ambracia moreover contained its memorials of his presence—namely, a temple of Venus, and a heroum, with a small archaic wooden image of Æneas.(60)

From the Actian coast Virgil conveys Æneas direct by sea to Buthrotum. Dionysius assigns the same course to Anchises; but he describes Æneas, and the most active part of the army, as making a land journey to Dodona, in order to consult the oracle. Here they dedicate some brazen bowls, some of which were extant in the time of Dionysius, with the names of the dedicators;(61) being, doubtless, forgeries of late date, like the

---

of the Mantineans were, as Müller points out, celebrated. Athen. iv. p. 154 D. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 136. See also Klausen, p. 337, 364.

(57) Dion. Hal. i. 50. The foundation of the celebrated temple of the Leucadian Apollo was ascribed to Æneas by Varro, Serv. ad Æn. iii. 279. Compare Klausen, ubi sup. p. 397. Ἀφροδίτη αἰνειάς is considered by Klausen as equivalent to *Venus placabilis;* the epithet being derived from *αἰνεῖν*, and having no connexion with Æneas; ib. p. 34. Concerning the canal by which the Leucadian peninsula was cut off from the mainland, see Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. iii. p. 539; Livy, xxxiii. 17.

(58) Dion. Hal. i. 50, who remarks that both the temple of Ἀφροδίτη Αἰνειάς at Actium, and that of the great gods (similarly attributed to the foundation of Æneas), were extant in his time: ἃ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ νῦν.

(59) ἤγετο δὲ καὶ πρότερον τὰ Ἄκτια τῷ θεῷ, στεφανίτης ἀγών, ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων· νυνὶ δ' ἐντιμότερον ἐποίησεν ὁ Καῖσαρ—Strab. vii. 7, § 6; and see Dio Cass. li. 1. These games are duly celebrated by the courtly poet of Rome, Æn. iii. 278—82; Servius, ad v. 280. Julius Cæsar speaks of himself as descended from Æneas and Iulus, in Dio Cass. xli. 34. He dedicated a temple to Venus, as being the author of his family; ib. xliii. 22.

(60) Dion. Hal. i. 50; Klausen, ubi sup. p. 416.

(61) ὧν τινες ἔτι περίεισιν ἐπιγραφαῖς πάνυ ἀρχαίαις δηλοῦντες τοὺς ἀναθέντας. Dion. Hal. i. 51.

oracle of Dodona above mentioned, and other relics of Trojan heroes.(62) From Dodona, Æneas and his companions descend to Buthrotum on the coast, where they rejoin Anchises and the fleet. At Buthrotum the meeting with Helenus occurs in Virgil, which Dionysius refers to Dodona; here also, or in its neighbourhood, were places which had been named after places in Troy, but were traced to Helenus and not to Æneas.(63)

Buthrotum is the nearest port on the mainland of Greece to the south-east point of Italy, and is the most convenient place for a ship sailing westward to cross the open sea, according to the coasting system of navigation pursued by the ancients. Virgil accordingly describes the fleet of Æneas as sailing to Italy from this part of the coast.(64) Dionysius, tempted by an etymology, carries it to Anchiasmos or Onchesmus, which is said to have been named after Anchises, and which likewise possessed a temple of Venus.(65) Here, according to Dionysius, the ships of Æneas procured pilots to steer them to Italy; one of whom, Patron of Thyrium, an Acarnanian, remained with him, and became the founder of a city in Sicily;(66) and the Romans (he adds) entertained so lively a sense of the assistance thus rendered cup inscribed with his name, which was extant in later times, together with other traces of his presence on that coast.(71)

---

(62) Above, ch. viii. § 2.

(63) Virg. Æn. iii. 349—51, and Varro ap. Serv. ad loc. Compare Klausen, p. 423.

(64) 'Provehimur pelago vicina Ceraunia juxta,
Unde iter Italiam, *cursusque brevissimus undis.*'
Æn. iii. 506-7.

(65) Dion. Hal. i. 51. Compare Klausen, p. 426. Thurium (written Θύρρειον), is mentioned, in the Epigram of Antipater, Anth. Pal. ix. 553, among the towns incorporated by Augustus in his new city of Nicopolis. Among the competitors in the foot race in the fifth book of the Æneid, Virgil includes Salius of Tegea, and Patron, an Acarnanian:

'Hunc Salius, simul et Patron; quorum alter Acarnan,
Alter ab Arcadio Tegeææ sanguine gentis.'—Æn. v. 298-9.

Salius seems to be the mythical author of the Salian dance, already mentioned (above, n. 56), and Patron the pilot of Thyrium. See Heyne, Exc. iii. ad Æn. v.; Klausen, p. 402.

(66) Πάτρων ὁ Θούριος, in the text of Dionysius. The place alluded to is Thyrium (Θύριον), a town of Acarnania. See Steph. Byz. in Θυρία; Livy, xxxvi. 11 and 12; xxxviii. 9. In Polyb. iv. 6, and 25, the name is written Θύριον: in xvii. 10, and xxviii. 5. it is written Θούριον: in xxii. 12, the gentile name is Θουριεύς. Androtion ap. Steph. Byz. wrote the gentile name Θούριος, as in Dionysius.

Dionysius and Virgil both represent Æneas as arriving at Drepanum; but they differ as to the course which he follows. The former takes him through the Straits of Messina;(72) whereas the latter describes him as steering for the temple of the Lacinian Juno, and passing Scylaceum and Caulonia, then sailing along the eastern coast of Sicily by Ætna and Syracuse; doubling the Cape of Pachynum; passing Camarina, Gela, Agrigentum, and Selinus; and lastly, having rounded the Lilybean extremity, as arriving at Drepanum; the same point which, according to Dionysius, he reaches in the opposite direction.(73)

From Drepanum the Æneas of Virgil sets sail for Italy, but is driven by contrary winds to the coast of Africa. Here he lands, and afterwards visits Carthage;(74) on which occasion the celebrated episode of Dido is introduced. Dionysius and the other Greek writers are wholly silent as to the visit of Æneas to Africa, and his relations with Dido.(75) This extension of the voyage of Æneas is however as old as Nævius, who introduced it into his poem on the First Punic War:(76) having probably been induced by the real events of the war to prefix to them this legendary connexion between Rome and Carthage.(77) Several among the heroes of the Trojan war were supposed to have visited places on the coast of Africa; Menelaus had landed in Egypt;(78) Ulysses was conceived to have touched on the same continent;(79) the Antenoridæ had gone to Cyrene;(80) and to Africa, and his relations with Dido.(75) This extension of the voyage of Æneas is however as old as Nævius, who introduced it into his poem on the First Punic War:(76) having probably been induced by the real events of the war to prefix to them this legendary connexion between Rome and Carthage.(77) Several among the heroes of the Trojan war were supposed to have visited places on the coast of Africa; Menelaus had landed in Egypt;(78) Ulysses was conceived to have touched on the same continent;(79) the Antenoridæ had gone to Cyrene;(80) and new establishments. Among many proofs that Æneas was really present on this coast, Dionysius alleges the existence of an altar of Venus Æneas at Elyma, and a temple of Æneas at Ægesta.(84)

---

(71) 'Along all this coast of the Gulf of Tarentum, there were various establishments ascribed to the heroes of the Trojan war—Epeus, Philoctetes, Nestor—or to their returning troops; of these establishments, probably, the occupants had been small, miscellaneous, unacknowledged bands of Grecian adventurers, who assumed to themselves the most honourable origin which they could imagine, and who became afterwards absorbed into the larger colonial establishments which followed; the latter adopting and taking upon themselves the heroic worship of Philoctetes, or other warriors from Troy, which the prior emigrants had begun.'—Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. iii. p. 508.

(72) Dionysius speaks of Æneas being driven to Drepanum by contrary winds, (*εἴτε καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων πονηρῶν βιασθέντες*, i. 32), which would have been impossible if Æneas had approached it from the south, as it would then have lain in his course. Moreover, as Klausen remarks, Patron is related to have founded Aluntium, which is on the northern coast; see p. 472. Ovid, who adopts Virgil's course for Æneas, with only slight variations, from Thrace to Sicily, Met. xiii. 623—724, here begins to differ: for he supposes Æneas to sail through the straits; he passes by Zancle and Pelorus; ib. 728-9.

(73) In Æn. i. 200-1, Æneas, addressing his companions, says:

> 'Vos et Scyllæam rabiem penitusque sonantes
> Accestis scopulos.'

Klausen thinks that when Virgil wrote his first book, he intended to take Æneas through the Straits of Messina, that this passage can only be understood as implying a passage by Scylla and Charybdis, p. 472, and that the circuitous voyage by Pachynum and Lilybæum was an afterthought. See Æn. iii. 410-3; 429—32.

(74) Æn. i. 31, 67-8, 156-7; iii. 715.

---

(75) See Klausen, p. 514. Ausonius, Epigr. 118, represents the historical account of Dido as knowing nothing of the visit of Æneas, and as attributing her suicide to the fear of Iarbas. See Justin, cited in n. 82.

(76) See Nævii Fragmenta, ed. Klussmann. p. 38—46. In the first book of this poem, Nævius described the departure of Æneas and Anchises from Troy, (ib. p. 40, 41), the ship in which Æneas sailed (p. 42), and the storm off the coast of Sicily, to which he was exposed, as in the beginning of the Æneid (p. 43). Nævius likewise mentioned who was the father of Anna and Dido. (See Serv. Æn. iv. 9.) Putting these circumstances together, it can scarcely be doubted that he described Æneas as landing at Carthage, and visiting Dido. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 192, refers to Dido the fragment of Nævius, in which some person is described as gently and cautiously inquiring in what manner Æneas left Troy:—

'Blande et docte percontat,
Æneas quo pacto Trojam urbem liquerit.'

Klausen however points out that Prochyta is mentioned in the first book (Serv. Æn. ix. 715), whereas this passage is cited from the second book: hence he refers it to Latinus or Evander.

(77) Dido is described by Virgil as predicting the Punic wars, and the campaign of Hannibal.

'Tum vos, o Tyrii, stirpem et genus omne futurum
Exercete odiis, cinerique hæc mittite nostro
Munera. Nullus amor populis, nec fœdera sunto.
Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor,
Qui face Dardanios ferroque sequare colonos,
Nunc, olim, quocunque dabunt se tempore vires,
Litora litoribus contraria, fluctibus undas
Imprecor, arma armis; pugnent ipsique nepotes.'
Æn. iv. 622-9.

It is by no means improbable that some prophetic allusion to the First Punic War was put by Nævius into the mouth of Dido or Anna. Klausen thinks that the legend of Dido originated among the Greek population of Eryx, where the First Punic War was decided; ib. p. 514—518. See his full account of Anna Perenna, p. 717—28, whose name he traces to a Latin root.

(78) See Hom. Od. iii. 300, iv. 351. Canopus was supposed to derive its name from the pilot of Menelaus, who was buried there. Strab. xvii. 1, § 17.

(79) The Lotophagi of the Odyssey (though doubtless a purely imaginary community) were localized by the ancients in Africa. See Od. ix. 84, and Nitzsch, ad loc.; also Herod. iv. 177.

(80) Pindar. Pyth. v. 110.

---

(75) See Klausen, p. 514. Ausonius, Epigr. 118, represents the historical account of Dido as knowing nothing of the visit of Æneas, and as attributing her suicide to the fear of Iarbas. See Justin, cited in n. 82.

(76) See Nævii Fragmenta, ed. Klussmann. p. 38—46. In the first book of this poem, Nævius described the departure of Æneas and Anchises from Troy, (ib. p. 40, 41), the ship in which Æneas sailed (p. 42), and the storm off the coast of Sicily, to which he was exposed, as in the beginning of the Æneid (p. 43). Nævius likewise mentioned who was the father of Anna and Dido. (See Serv. Æn. iv. 9.) Putting these circumstances together, it can scarcely be doubted that he described Æneas as landing at Carthage, and visiting Dido. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 192, refers to Dido the fragment of Nævius, in which some person is described as gently and cautiously inquiring in what manner Æneas left Troy:—

'Blande et docte percontat,
Æneas quo pacto Trojam urbem liquerit.'

Klausen however points out that Prochyta is mentioned in the first book (Serv. Æn. ix. 715), whereas this passage is cited from the second book: hence he refers it to Latinus or Evander.

(77) Dido is described by Virgil as predicting the Punic wars, and the campaign of Hannibal.

'Tum vos, o Tyrii, stirpem et genus omne futurum
Exercete odiis, cinerique hæc mittite nostro
Munera. Nullus amor populis, nec fœdera sunto.
Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor,
Qui face Dardanios ferroque sequare colonos,
Nunc, olim, quocunque dabunt se tempore vires,
Litora litoribus contraria, fluctibus undas
Imprecor, arma armis; pugnent ipsique nepotes.'
Æn. iv. 622-9.

It is by no means improbable that some prophetic allusion to the First Punic War was put by Nævius into the mouth of Dido or Anna. Klausen thinks that the legend of Dido originated among the Greek population of Eryx, where the First Punic War was decided; ib. p. 514—518. See his full account of Anna Perenna, p. 717—28, whose name he traces to a Latin root.

(78) See Hom. Od. iii. 300, iv. 351. Canopus was supposed to derive its name from the pilot of Menelaus, who was buried there. Strab. xvii. 1, § 17.

(79) The Lotophagi of the Odyssey (though doubtless a purely imaginary community) were localized by the ancients in Africa. See Od. ix. 84, and Nitzsch, ad loc.; also Herod. iv. 177.

(80) Pindar. Pyth. v. 110.

The account of Virgil is not very different. Æneas, on reaching Eryx, is hospitably entertained by Acestes (another form of Ægestus), of Trojan descent, and his companion Elymus. Before he sails for Italy, he founds the city of Acesta (Egesta or Segesta); and also the temple of Venus at Eryx.(85) The belief in the

---

(84) i. 52, 3. Æneas, carrying Anchises and the palladium from Troy, is represented on coins of Segesta; Leake, Num. Hellen. (ins.) p. 69, 80.

(85) Urbem appellabunt permisso nomine Acestam.
Æn. v. 718.

Interea Æneas urbem designat aratro,
Sortiturque domos, hoc Ilium et hæc loca Trojam
Esse jubet. Gaudet regno Trojanus Acestes,
Indicitque forum, et patribus dat jura vocatis.
Tum vicina astris Erycino in vertice sedes
Fundatur Veneri Idaliæ, tumuloque sacerdos
Ac lucus late sacer additur Anchiseo.—v. 755-61.

Thucydides, vi. 2, says that Eryx and Egesta were founded by Trojans who escaped from Troy, together with some Phoceans returning from Troy, who were first driven by a storm to the coast of Africa, and afterwards landed in Sicily. According to Strabo, xiii. 1, § 53, there were rivers named Scamander and Simois at Segesta. Virgil, on the other hand, speaks of the names Ilium and Troja being preserved there. Pausanias, v. 25, § 6, says generally, that Phrygians from the river Scamander and the Troad settled in Sicily. According to the legend in Serv. Æn. i. 550, Egesta was founded by Egestus the son of the river Crimisus and of Egesta, a Trojan woman, sent abroad by her parents in order to avoid exposure to a sea-monster. Compare Æn. v. 38.

Cicero attests the national recognition of the foundation of Segesta by Æneas: 'Segesta est oppidum pervetus in Siciliâ, judices, quod ab Æneâ fugiente a Trojâ, atque in hæc loca veniente, conditum esse demonstrant. Itaque Segestani non solum perpetuâ societate atque amicitiâ, verum etiam cognatione se cum populo Romano conjunctos esse arbitrantur;' in Verr. iv. 33. Segesta, quæ nunc appellatur, oppidum in Siciliâ est, quod videtur Æneas condidisse præposito ibi Egesto, qui eam Egestam nominavit. Sed præposita est ei S littera, ne obsceno nomine appellaretur, ut factum est in Malevento, quod Beneventum dictum est, et in Epidamno, quod usurpatur Dyrrhachium; Festus, p. 340. This passage explains why the Romans changed the old Greek name of Egesta into Segesta; but it treats Egestus, its eponymous hero, as a companion of Æneas. The Romans changed Egesta into Segesta, on account of the resemblance of sound with the Latin word *egestas*. The S was probably prefixed on account of the word *seges*

Mela, ii. 7, attributes the foundation of the temple of Venus at Eryx to Æneas. This temple existed during the Peloponnesian war; Thuc. vi. 46. Compare Polyb. ii. 7. Diodorus describes the temple as having been founded by Eryx, the son of Venus, and of Butas, a native king; adding that it was new establishments. Among many proofs that Æneas was really present on this coast, Dionysius alleges the existence of an altar of Venus Æneas at Elyma, and a temple of Æneas at Ægesta.(84)

The account of Virgil is not very different. Æneas, on reaching Eryx, is hospitably entertained by Acestes (another form of Ægestus), of Trojan descent, and his companion Elymus. Before he sails for Italy, he founds the city of Acesta (Egesta or Segesta); and also the temple of Venus at Eryx.(85) The belief in the

---

(84) i. 52, 3. Æneas, carrying Anchises and the palladium from Troy, is represented on coins of Segesta; Leake, Num. Hellen. (ins.) p. 69, 80.

(85) Urbem appellabunt permisso nomine Acestam.
Æn. v. 718.

Interea Æneas urbem designat aratro,
Sortiturque domos, hoc Ilium et hæc loca Trojam
Esse jubet. Gaudet regno Trojanus Acestes,
Indicitque forum, et patribus dat jura vocatis.
Tum vicina astris Erycino in vertice sedes
Fundatur Veneri Idaliæ, tumuloque sacerdos
Ac lucus late sacer additur Anchiseo.—v. 755-61.

Thucydides, vi. 2, says that Eryx and Egesta were founded by Trojans who escaped from Troy, together with some Phoceans returning from Troy, who were first driven by a storm to the coast of Africa, and afterwards landed in Sicily. According to Strabo, xiii. 1, § 53, there were rivers named Scamander and Simois at Segesta. Virgil, on the other hand, speaks of the names Ilium and Troja being preserved there. Pausanias, v. 25, § 6, says generally, that Phrygians from the river Scamander and the Troad settled in Sicily. According to the legend in Serv. Æn. i. 550, Egesta was founded by Egestus the son of the river Crimisus and of Egesta, a Trojan woman, sent abroad by her parents in order to avoid exposure to a sea-monster. Compare Æn. v. 38.

Cicero attests the national recognition of the foundation of Segesta by Æneas: 'Segesta est oppidum pervetus in Siciliâ, judices, quod ab Æneâ fugiente a Trojâ, atque in hæc loca veniente, conditum esse demonstrant. Itaque Segestani non solum perpetuâ societate atque amicitiâ, verum etiam cognatione se cum populo Romano conjunctos esse arbitrantur;' in Verr. iv. 33. Segesta, quæ nunc appellatur, oppidum in Siciliâ est, quod videtur Æneas condidisse præposito ibi Egesto, qui eam Egestam nominavit. Sed præposita est ei S littera, ne obsceno nomine appellaretur, ut factum est in Malevento, quod Beneventum dictum est, et in Epidamno, quod usurpatur Dyrrhachium; Festus, p. 340. This passage explains why the Romans changed the old Greek name of Egesta into Segesta; but it treats Egestus, its eponymous hero, as a companion of Æneas. The Romans changed Egesta into Segesta, on account of the resemblance of sound with the Latin word *egestas*. The S was probably prefixed on account of the word *seges*

Mela, ii. 7, attributes the foundation of the temple of Venus at Eryx to Æneas. This temple existed during the Peloponnesian war; Thuc. vi. 46. Compare Polyb. ii. 7. Diodorus describes the temple as having been founded by Eryx, the son of Venus, and of Butas, a native king; adding that it was

Thessaly, is reported to have been thus compelled to remain on the coast of Thrace, where he founded Mende and Scione.(88) A similar incident is placed at Setæum near Sybaris; where Setæa, the author of the outrage, was crucified by the offended Greeks.(89) Neæthus likewise, a river to the north of Croton, was connected with the same story on etymological grounds (from ναῦς and αἴθω).(90) Strabo says generally, that the act of the Trojan women is assigned to many places; he considers it incredible, though possible.(91) The earliest authority for this story is Aristotle, who related that some Greeks, on their return from Troy, having sailed round the promontory of Malea, and having been driven by violent winds to Latium, in the land of the Opici, were compelled by this stratagem of their captive Trojan women, who feared the prospect of slavery in Greece, to become settlers in the country which they had reached.(92)

---

(88) See Conon, c. 13, where Æthilla, the leader of the Trojan women, is described as telling her fellow-prisoners, that if they went with the Greeks to Greece, their sufferings at Troy would appear as gold in the comparison —ὡς, εἰ ἀφίκοιντο σὺν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, χρυσὸς ἂν αὐταῖς δόξειε τὰ τῆς Τροίας κακά. Compare Steph. Byz. in Σκιώνη, who gives the same account of the foundation of the town; as also Polyæn. vii. 47, who names Anthia, instead of Æthilla. Raoul-Rochette, Hist. des Col. Grecques, tom. ii. p. 383, treats this narrative as historical, but is unable to reconcile it with the positive statement of Homer, that Protesilaus was the first Greek killed at Troy (Iliad, ii. 698-702), and with his tomb in the neighbourhood where Alexander offered sacrifices (Arrian, Anab. i. 11). Compare Eurip. Fragm. ed. Wagner, p. 331. His tomb was likewise shown in the Thracian Chersonese; Strab. xiii. 1, § 31; vii. fragm. 52.

(89) See Lycophr. 1075, with the note of Tzetzes; Steph. Byz. in Σηταῖον.

(90) See Strab. vi. 1, § 12, who describes the inducements of the Trojan women to have been the tedium of the voyage, and the fertility of the soil. In this locality, they are the captives of the Greeks. A similar account of this river (written both Νήαιθος and Ναύαιθος) is given by Tzetzes ad Lyc. 921, from Apollodorus, and by Schol. Theocrit. iv. 24. The leaders of the enterprize, according to Apollodorus, were Æthylla, Astyoche, and Medesicaste, daughters of Laomedon, and sisters of Priam; and the women concerned in it were thence called Ναυπρήστιδες. Their motive was to avoid slavery in Greece. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. i. p. 180. The name Αἴθυλλα alludes to αἴθω.

(91) vi. i. § 14. καὶ τὸ τῶν Τρωάδων δὲ τόλμημα περιφέρεται πολλαχοῦ, καὶ ἄπιστον φαίνεται, καίπερ δυνατὸν ὄν. Compare Klausen, p. 452-3; Heyne, Exc. vi. ad Æn. v.

(92) Ap. Dion. Hal. i. 72. An exactly similar version of this story is given in Pseud-Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 109, Daunia being however substituted for Latium. It is here introduced as an explanation of the

Thessaly, is reported to have been thus compelled to remain on the coast of Thrace, where he founded Mende and Scione.(88) A similar incident is placed at Setæum near Sybaris; where Setæa, the author of the outrage, was crucified by the offended Greeks.(89) Neæthus likewise, a river to the north of Croton, was connected with the same story on etymological grounds (from ναῦς and αἴθω).(90) Strabo says generally, that the act of the Trojan women is assigned to many places; he considers it incredible, though possible.(91) The earliest authority for this story is Aristotle, who related that some Greeks, on their return from Troy, having sailed round the promontory of Malea, and having been driven by violent winds to Latium, in the land of the Opici, were compelled by this stratagem of their captive Trojan women, who feared the prospect of slavery in Greece, to become settlers in the country which they had reached.(92)

---

(88) See Conon, c. 13, where Æthilla, the leader of the Trojan women, is described as telling her fellow-prisoners, that if they went with the Greeks to Greece, their sufferings at Troy would appear as gold in the comparison —ὡς, εἰ ἀφίκοιντο σὺν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, χρυσὸς ἂν αὐταῖς δόξειε τὰ τῆς Τροίας κακά. Compare Steph. Byz. in Σκιώνῃ, who gives the same account of the foundation of the town; as also Polyæn. vii. 47, who names Anthia, instead of Æthilla. Raoul-Rochette, Hist. des Col. Grecques, tom. ii. p. 383, treats this narrative as historical, but is unable to reconcile it with the positive statement of Homer, that Protesilaus was the first Greek killed at Troy (Iliad, ii. 698-702), and with his tomb in the neighbourhood where Alexander offered sacrifices (Arrian, Anab. i. 11). Compare Eurip. Fragm. ed. Wagner, p. 331. His tomb was likewise shown in the Thracian Chersonese; Strab. xiii. 1, § 31; vii. fragm. 52.

(89) See Lycophr. 1075, with the note of Tzetzes; Steph. Byz. in Σηταῖον.

(90) See Strab. vi. 1, § 12, who describes the inducements of the Trojan women to have been the tedium of the voyage, and the fertility of the soil. In this locality, they are the captives of the Greeks. A similar account of this river (written both Νήαιθος and Ναύαιθος) is given by Tzetzes ad Lyc. 921, from Apollodorus, and by Schol. Theocrit. iv. 24. The leaders of the enterprize, according to Apollodorus, were Æthylla, Astyoche, and Medesicaste, daughters of Laomedon, and sisters of Priam; and the women concerned in it were thence called Ναυπρήστιδες. Their motive was to avoid slavery in Greece. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. i. p. 180. The name Αἴθυλλα alludes to αἴθω.

(91) vi. i. § 14. καὶ τὸ τῶν Τρῳάδων δὲ τόλμημα περιφέρεται πολλαχοῦ, καὶ ἄπιστον φαίνεται, καίπερ δυνατὸν ὄν. Compare Klausen, p. 452-3; Heyne, Exc. vi. ad Æn. v.

(92) Ap. Dion. Hal. i. 72. An exactly similar version of this story is given in Pseud-Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 109, Daunia being however substituted for Latium. It is here introduced as an explanation of the

Virgil and Dionysius, however, both connect this celebrated feat of the Trojan women with the port of Eryx, and the fleet of Æneas; though in so doing they diminish the hardihood and impair the patriotism of the act. Dionysius is indeed in doubt whether it was in consequence of the fatigues of the voyage, or of the burning of a part of his fleet, that Æneas left a portion of his followers behind him at Egesta.(93) Virgil represents the ships as having been set on fire by the matrons, at the instigation of Juno; but as having been saved from destruction, with the exception of four, by a miraculous shower of rain.(94) The crews of these ships, with the aged and infirm part of the expedition, remain under the protection of Acestes.(95)

Another version of the same story connected it indeed with Æneas, but placed the incident in Italy, at the end of his course, not in the intermediate station of Sicily. The author of the work on the Priestesses of Juno (attributed to Hellanicus) described Roma, a Trojan woman, as the author of the act, when the city of Rome was founded by Æneas, in company with Ulysses.(96) Heraclides Lembus, who lived about 150 B.C., attributed the foundation of Rome, and the burning of the ships, to a Trojan woman named Roma, but without, as it appears, mentioning Æneas.(97)

Daunian custom of wearing black clothes; though it is not easy to see how the legend serves this purpose. The close resemblance of these two versions raises a doubt whether Dionysius quoted from a *genuine* writing of Aristotle.

(93) i. 52. Minoa in Sicily was founded by Cretans who went with Minos to that island, and whose ships were burnt by the Sicani, in order to prevent their return. Diod. iv. 79.

(94) Æn. v. 604-699.

(95) Æn. v. 711-8.

(96) Dion. Hal. i. 72. Damastes of Sigeum and other writers are stated to agree in this account; but whether the agreement extended to the incident of the ships, is uncertain.

(97) See Festus in Romam, p. 269; Solin. i. 2; Serv. ad Æn. i. 273. Heraclides Lembus was contemporary with Ptolemy Philometor, 181—147 B.C.: Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 167. The same story is repeated by Plutarch, as one of the versions of the origin of the name of Rome; Romul. 1: Mul. Virt. 2; Quæst. Rom. 6. In the two latter places, it serves as an explanatory legend for the custom of the Roman women to embrace, as well as to kiss, their near kinsmen. It is repeated in the same form by Polyæn. viii. 25. 2, but in connexion with Æneas. In this account the ships are burnt at the mouth of the Tiber.

Aristotle likewise, at an earlier date, had placed the burning of the ships by Trojan women in Latium. Caieta was even fixed upon as the seat of the incendiary act.(98) The connexion of this incident with Italy was indeed so deeply rooted in legendary lore, that Virgil, who had placed it in Sicily, nevertheless introduced it a second time in another shape; for the attempt of Turnus to burn the ships of Æneas, and their conversion into nymphs, as described in the ninth book of the Æneid, is evidently an echo of the former event.(99)

Notwithstanding the ancient and poetical legend of the burning of the Trojan fleet, the ship of Æneas, built of timber of extraordinary length, was shown at Rome, and preserved as a precious national relic, in the time of Procopius.(100) According to Nævius, indeed, Æneas came to Italy in a single ship, which had been fabricated by the hands of Mercury,(101) in the same manner that the Argo had been built by the directions of Minerva.(102)

The games which Virgil introduces in the fifth book, on the occasion of the second visit of Æneas to Sicily, enable him to celebrate the supposed founders of some great Roman families,(103)

---

(98) One of the explanations of the name Caieta, on the Campanian coast, derived it from καίειν, on the ground that the Trojan fleet was here accidentally burnt; Serv. ad Æn. vii. 1. It was also said that Caieta was a Trojan woman, who received this cognomen because she had instigated the burning of the fleet (like Æthilla, Anthia, or Setæa, above mentioned); Script. de Or. Gent. Il. c. 10. See below, n 117.

(99) Æn. ix. 69-122; cf. x. 217-55. The apology of Heyne (ad. v. 77) for this metamorphosis seems quite unnecessary. See also Ovid, Met. xiv. 527-65.

(100) See Bell. Goth. ii. 22, where Procopius describes the ship at length, from personal inspection. The silence of all former writers respecting so remarkable a relic, and his statement that all its timber was perfectly preserved, and no part of it showed any mark of decay, leads to the belief that it was of no great antiquity. Procopius died about 565 A.D.

(101) Serv. ad Æn. i. 170. See Nævius, p. 42, ed. Klussmann. In the Tabula Iliaca, Mercury is represented as conducting Æneas from Troy.

(102) See Apollon. Rhod. i. 19.

(103) Thus in the account of the ship-race, the Memmian, Sergian, and Cluentian houses are traced to Trojan progenitors:

> Velocem Mnestheus agit acri remige Pristin:
> Mox Italus Mnestheus, genus a quo nomine Memmi.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Sergestusque, domus tenet a quo Sergia nomen,

and likewise to establish a mythological origin for the equestrian *Ludus Trojæ*, solemnized by Julius Cæsar, and more than once by Augustus.(104) The pedigree of this ancient diversion is thus deduced by Virgil, in a manner flattering to his imperial patron.

> Hunc morem, hos cursus, atque hæc certamina primus
> Ascanius, Longam muris quum cingeret Albam,
> Rettulit, et priscos docuit celebrare Latinos,
> Quo puer ipse modo, secum quo Troia pubes.
> Albani docuere suos; hinc maxima porro
> Accepit Roma, et patrium servavit honorem;
> Trojaque *nunc*, pueri Trojanum dicitur agmen.(105)

§ 7 After these games, the Æneas of Virgil sails from the western point of Sicily to his predestined dominions on the Tiber; in Dionysius, he sails from the same place, though without the deviation to Africa.

The first point of Italian land which Æneas approaches, after his departure from Sicily, is the promontory of Palinurus, lying to the south of Velia.(106) This headland receives its name from his pilot, who falls overboard, and is there washed ashore, according to Virgil; or is buried there, according to Diodorus.(107)

> Centauro invehitur magnâ, Scyllâque Cloanthus
> Cæruleâ, genus unde tibi, Romane Cluenti.—v. 116-23.

Lower down, v. 564, the town of Politorium is derived from Polites, and the family of the Atii from Atys; v. 568. Atia, the mother of Augustus, belonged to the Atii, who were a plebeian gens, of no great antiquity (see Cic. Phil. iii. 6), but the connexion with Augustus was a sufficient reason for tracing it to a Trojan ancestor. Concerning the origin of the name Mnestheus, in this context, see Klausen, ubi sup. p. 467.

(104) See Suet. Cæsar, 39; Octav. 43; with numerous other passages quoted by Klausen, p. 820.

(105) v. 596-602. Compare Heyne, Exc. v. Klausen considers the custom as ancient, and long prior to J. Cæsar: he conjectures, not improbably, that the name is connected with the old verb *troare* or *truare*, which expresses animated motion; p. 823. The resemblance of the word to the name of the Phrygian city is doubtless accidental.

(106) Concerning the promontory Palinurus, see Strab. vi. 1, § 1; Plin. N. H. iii. 10.

(107) Æn. v. 833-71; Dion. Hal. i. 53. Solinus, ii. 13, and Mela, ii. 4, likewise state that the promontory was named from the pilot of Æneas. Palinurus was worshipped as a hero—'Lucanis, pestilentiâ laborantibus, respondit oraculum, manes Palinuri esse placandos. Ob quam rem non

writers to the voyage of Æneas. Thus the island of Ænaria, near Prochyta (like Ænus and Ænea in northern Greece), was, owing to the similarity of sound, derived from Æneas.(112) Baiæ, again, was by some writers alleged to have been named after Boia, the nurse of Euximus, a companion of Æneas.(113) The name Capua was likewise generally traced to Capys, a Trojan; even the ancient Hecatæus of Miletus is said to have known of this origin, which was naturally suggested by the resemblance of the name to that of Capys, the Trojan prince, and father of Anchises, in Homer.(114) Cœlius Antipater, one of the earlier Roman historians, supposed Capys, the founder of Capua, to have been the cousin of Æneas; and Virgil traces the name to a like origin.(115) For a similar reason, the foundation of

---

(112) Ænaria ipsa a statione navium Æneæ, Homero Inarime dicta, Græcis Pithecusa; Plin. N. H. iii. 12. Ænariam appellavere locum, ubi Æneas classem a Trojâ veniens appulit; Festus, p. 20. Compare Ovid, Met. xiv. 89-100.

(113) Serv. ad Æn. ix. 710. Postumius de adventu Æneæ et Lutatius Communium Historiarum, Boiam Euximi comitis Æneæ nutricem et ab ejus nomine Baias vocatas dicunt. . . . . Varro et a Baio Ulixis comite, qui illic sepultus est, Baias dictas tradit. Compare Krause, Fragm. Hist. Rom. p. 131, 320.

(114) Hecat. Fr. 27. Compare Iliad, xx. 239; Apollod. iii. 12, § 2. Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 173, believes that the name Capua is not earlier than the fifth century of the city, and long posterior to Hecatæus: he believes that the geographical works of this early writer were interpolated and revised in later times.

(115) Serv. ad Æn. x. 145. Cœliusque Trojanum Capyn condidisse Capuam tradidit, eumque Æneæ fuisse sobrinum. There appears to be no ground for the suspicion of Krause, ib. p. 200, that this Cœlius is not L. Cœlius Antipater the historian. There was a tomb of Capys, the founder of the city, at Capua: a brazen plate, containing a marvellous prophecy of the death of Julius Cæsar, was said to have been discovered in it a short time before that event; Suet. Cæs. 81. Virgil includes Capys among the principal companions of Æneas: Æn. i. 183; ii. 35; ix. 576; and makes him the eponymous hero of Capua:

> Affuit et Mnestheus, quem pulsi pristina Turni
> Aggere mœrorum sublimem gloria tollit;
> Et Capys: hinc nomen Campanæ ducitur urbi.
> Æn. x. 143-5.

One story represented Remus (or Romus) the son of Æneas, as founding Capua, and naming it from his great grandsire, the father of Anchises; Dion. Hal. i. 73; Syncellus, vol. i. p. 364, ed. Bonn. A legend of a similar nature was adopted by the pseudo-Cephalon; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 70. Silius, xi. 177-9, likewise finds the origin of Capua in Capys, the father of Anchises. Another explanation assumed that Capys, the founder of Capua, was a Trojan, but that his expedition to Italy was unconnected

Caphyæ in Arcadia was, as we have already seen, connected with a visit of Æneas.(116)

The last place on the Campanian coast, which receives its name from the Trojan expedition, is Caieta. This feminine noun is, by a fiction of frequent recurrence, derived from a woman. The nurse of Æneas is related to have been here interred, and her tomb was doubtless exhibited on some part of the coast.(117)

§ 8 The long voyage of Æneas has now reached its predestined termination, and he lands, with his companions, at

---

with that of Æneas; Serv. ad Æn. i. 2. A fourth explanation identified the founder of Capua with Capys, the Alban king, and son of Capetus; Serv. ad Æn. x. 145. See below, ch. x. § 2. Livy, iv. 37, mentions the received derivation of Capua from Capys; but makes him a Samnite general of the year 423 B.C., who gave his name to the city, previously called Vulturnum. Livy himself nevertheless prefers the derivation from *Campi;* which is likewise mentioned in Festus, p. 43. Capys the Samnite is moreover adduced by Serv. Æn. x. 145. Servius here enumerates three additional explanations, viz., one by Varro, the text of which is corrupt, but which derived it from the fertility of the soil and the mildness of the climate; and two from the Etruscan word *Capys*, which signified a hawk. One of the latter etymologies traced the word to an augury of a hawk; the other derived the name from that of a founder who was called hawk, because he had crooked toes. The latter origin is likewise given by Festus, in Capuam. p. 43. Both these Etruscan etymologies are rejected by Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 172. Strabo, v. 4, § 3, derives the name *Capua* from *caput*, because it was the head of twelve cities. Some form like *Capitolium* seems however a more natural derivative from *caput*. Compare Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 171-3; Klausen, ib. p. 550; Raoul-Rochette, Hist. des Col. Grecques, vol. ii. p. 356.

(116) Above, p. 311.

(117) Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Æneia nutrix,
Æternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti;
Et nunc servat honos sedem tuus, ossaque nomen
Hesperiâ in magnâ, si qua est ea gloria, signat.
At pius exequiis Æneas rite solutis,
Aggere composito tumuli, &c.—Æn. vii. 1-6.

Compare Ovid, Met. xiv. 157; 441-44, who gives an inscription for her tomb. Dion. Hal. i. 53 (compare Klausen, p. 1049, note), mentions the nurse of Æneas, as does Strabo, v. 3, § 6; but the latter derives the name from *καιέτα*, the Lacedæmonian word for *hollow;* the neighbouring town of Formiæ being, according to him, a Lacedæmonian foundation. Solinus, ii. 13, says: 'Par sententia est inter auctores a gubernatore Æneæ appellatum Palinurum, a tubicine Misenum, a consobrinâ Leucosiam insulam, a nutrice Caietam, ab uxore Lavinium.' The writer De Origin. Gent. Rom. c. 10, records an explanation which derived the name of Caieta from the woman who stimulated the Trojan matrons to burn the ships, tracing it to the Greek *καίω*. Servius likewise alludes to this explanation, adding that

Laurentum,(118) near the southern bank of the Tiber. A detachment of his expedition, however, was supposed to have sailed still further north, and to have formed a permanent colony in the Island of Sardinia; whose descendants continued, in subsequent times, to bear the name of Ilienses, in memory of their Trojan origin.(119) Some Trojans were likewise supposed to have penetrated as far as Gaul.(120)

It should be observed that along the whole coast of Italy and Sicily, which Æneas was fabled to have visited, there were legendary reminiscences of Ulysses, which rivalled, if they did not outnumber, those of the Trojan wanderer. As soon as many of the imaginary places described in the Odyssey were identified with real localities in southern Italy and Sicily, it was natural that the celebrated name of Ulysses should become attached to other spots in the same region. The Thrinacria of Homer had at

---

this was the scene of the event. He further states that some authorities made Caieta the nurse of Creusa,and some of Ascanius. 'Hanc alii Æneæ, alii Creusæ, alii Ascanii nutricem volunt. Lectum tamen est in Philologis in hoc loco classem Trojanorum casu concrematam: unde Caieta dicta, ἀπὸ τοῦ καίειν;' ad Æn. vii. 1. Concerning the burning of the ships, see above, p. 319. The mythology relating to Caieta is collected by Klausen, p. 1044-56, who attempts a Latin etymology of the name.

(118) Dion. Hal. i. 73; Appian, Hist. Rom. i. 1; Livy, i. 1, mentions the Laurens ager as the place of his landing. Virgil, Æn. vii. 29-32, is not very precise in his description. See Heyne, Exc. ii. and iii. ad Æn. vii. Ovid follows the Æneid, Met. xiv. 447. According to Virgil, the voyage of Æneas occupies at least seven years; Æn. i. 755; v. 626.

(119) The Ilienses in Sardinia were derived from a portion of the expedition of Æneas, according to Paus. x. 17, § 6. They were a Trojan colony according to Sallust, ap. Serv. Æn. i. 601. Compare Livy, xl. 19; xli. 12.

(120) Aiunt quidam paucos post excidium Trojæ, fugitantes Græcos ubique dispersos, loca hæc occupasse tunc vacua. Ammian. Marcellin. xv. 9. The Arverni were said to be a Trojan colony:

Arvernoque ausi Latio se fingere fratres,
Sanguine ab Iliaco populi.—Lucan, i. 427.

A similar claim seems to have been made by the Ædui; Cæsar, B. G. i. 33; Cic. Ep. ad Div. vii. 10; Tacit. Ann. xi. 25. The mythical founder of Præneste was generally called Cæculus, whose marvellous birth was celebrated: but one legend referred its origin to Cæcas, a companion of Æneas; Festus, in Cæculus, p. 44. Sulmo was also said to have been founded by Solymus, a companion of Æneas; Ovid, Fast. iv. 79-80. Ulysses was supposed to have penetrated into Caledonia; Solinus, c. 22: Calidonicus angulus, in quo recessu Ulyxem Caledoniæ appulsum manifestat ara Græcis literis scripta votum.

an early period been identified with Sicily; Charybdis and Scylla had been likewise placed in the Straits of Messina.(121) Sicily again was the region selected for the habitation of the Cyclopes; the Læstrygones were sometimes placed in the same island,(122) sometimes near Formiæ in Italy.(123) The island of the Sirens, also, was assigned both to Sicily and Italy. Even in the ancient Theogony of Hesiod is to be found a trace of the belief which localized Circe in Latium;(124) and the tomb of Elpenor was shown on the Latin coast.(125) The island of Calypso was moreover discovered to have been situated off the Lacinian promontory;(126) and the name of the Island of Æolus was at an early date transferred to the Lipari Islands.(127) With this groundwork to build upon, it was easy for the mythologist to say that Scylaceum was founded by Ulysses;(128) to place a watch-tower of Ulysses in the Ithacesian Islands near Hipponium;(129) to assign a heroum near Temesa, in the Bruttian territory, to Polites, a companion of Ulysses;(130) to trace the foundation of a temple of Minerva, in the same country, to this renowned wanderer;(131) to give a heroum near Laus to another of his companions named Dracon;(132) and to find in him a founder for the temple of Minerva, at the extremity of the Surrentine promontory.(133) Telegonus, moreover, the son of Ulysses and Circe, penetrates further into the interior: he is the mythical founder of Tusculum;(134) and Octavius Mamilius of Tusculum, in the reign of Tarquinius Superbus, is related to have traced his descent through Telegonus to Ulysses.(135) Sometimes the names of the Greek and Trojan hero are confounded in the legendary phantasmagoria; and the same place is successively connected with both. Thus in one part of the coast, Polites is a companion of Ulysses, who is worshipped as a hero; in another, he is a companion of Æneas, who founds a city.(136) Baiæ and Misenum are variously reported to have been named after companions of both heroes;(137) and the visit of Ulysses

---

(121) Thucyd. iv. 24, says that the strait between Italy and Sicily is the Charybdis, through which Ulysses sailed. In this narrow channel, he adds, the currents from the Tyrrhenian and Sicilian seas meet, and break against each other with much violence. Compare Grote. vol. i. p. 336, 426, on the legends respecting the presence of Ulysses and other wanderers from Troy on the coasts of Sicily and southern Italy.

(122) Thucyd. vi. 2. *παλαιότατοι μὲν λέγονται ἐν μέρει τινὶ τῆς χώρας Κύκλωπες καὶ Λαιστρυγόνες οἰκῆσαι.* Compare Virg. Æn. iii. 569. Strabo, i. 2, § 9, states that the Cyclopes were placed near Ætna, the Læstrygons near Leontium.

(123) See Horat. Carm. iii. 16, v. 34; ib. 17, v. 1-9. The noble Roman family of Lamiæ derived their origin from Lamus, king of the Læstrygons, mentioned in Od. x. 10.

(124) Theog. 1011-5. Ulysses and Circe beget Agrius and Latinus, who, in the recesses of the sacred islands, rule over all the Tyrrhenians. On this passage, see Müller's Etrusker, vol. i. p. 189. Circeii, on the Campanian coast, obtained its name from this belief. See Dion. Hal. iv. 63; Heyne, Exc. i. ad Æn. vii. The cup of Ulysses (alluding to Od. x. 316) was shown at this place; Strab. v. 3, § 6.

The connexion of Circe with the ancient Italian god Picus (above, p. 299, note 7), has arisen from the identification of the abode of Circe with the promontory on the coast of Latium. Compare Æn. vii. 282. Circe received divine honours at Circeii: 'Circen coloni nostri Circeienses religiose colunt,' says Cicero; N. D. iii. 19. The belief in the existence of a peculiar poisonous plant which grew at Circæum (Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. 78) doubtless originated in the notion of Circe as a *venefica*.

(125) Theophrast. Hist. Plant. v. 8; Scylax, p. 166, ed. Klausen; Plin. H. N. xv. 36. Compare Od. x. 552-60; xi. 51-80; xii. 9-15.

(126) Plin. H. N. iii. 15. Ogygia, the land of Calypso, was far away in the sea; Od. vii. 244: xii. 448. *νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, ὅθι τ' ὀμφαλός ἐστι θαλάσσης*, i. 50. Compare Nitzsch, Anm. zur Od. vol. i. p. 16. In Plutarch's time, Ogygia was said to be an island five days' sail to the west of Britain; several new fabulous circumstances being added. The island receded as discovery advanced; Plut. de fac. in orbe lun. c. 26. Compare the similar account in Def. Orac. 18. Concerning the identification of fictitious names in the Odyssey with real places in Italy and Sicily,

---

see Nitzsch, ib. vol. iii. p. xxxv. See also Ukert, Geogr. der Gr. und Röm. i. 2, p. 310-9; and Voelcker, Homerische Geographie, p. 106-126, on the geography of the Odyssey.

(127) Nitzsch, ib. vol. iii. p. 94. See Thuc. iii. 115.

(128) Serv. ad Æn. iii. 553.

(129) Plin. H. N. iii. 13; Solin. iii. 2.

(130) See Strab. vi. 1, § 5. Polites, a companion of Ulysses, in Od. x. 224. Another story with full details respecting the hero of Temesa, is in Paus. vi. 6, § 7-11; Comp. Ælian, V. H. viii. 18. See likewise Nitzsch, ib. vol. i. p. 36.

(131) Solin. ii. 9. (132) Strab. vi. 1, § 1. (133) Strab. v. 4, § 8.

(134) See Horat. Carm. iii. 29; 8, with Orelli's note; Ovid, Fast. iii. 92; iv. 71.

(135) Livy, i. 49; Dion. Hal. iv. 45. According to Hyginus, Fab. 137, Italus, the son of Penelope and Telegonus, gave his name to Italy.

(136) Above, n. 130; Serv. ad Æn. v. 564.

(137) Above, notes 110 and 113, where they are companions of Æneas. In Strabo, i. 2, § 18, and v. 4, § 6, they are called companions of Ulysses:

to Hades is connected by the ancients with the same Avernus, near Cumæ, which is the scene of the descent of Æneas with the Sibyl.(138) Æneas is likewise described by the Roman poets as finding companions of Ulysses, who had been abandoned by him in his course: thus he meets with one in Virgil who had been left in the cave of the Cyclops;(139) and in Ovid with another who had stayed behind at Cumæ.(140) The Trojan hero is however supposed to sail in safety by the island of Circe, and to hear at a distance the roaring of the enchanted wild beasts; whereas his Grecian predecessor had been here exposed to imminent danger from the charms of the sorceress.(141) In one account ascribed to Hellanicus, Æneas and Ulysses come together to Italy from the country of the Molossians, and found Rome.(142) Even the Argonauts, whose voyage was generally placed in the eastern waters, were not altogether excluded from this mythological kaleidoscope; for, according to the report of

---

Servius ad Æn. ix. 710, mentions both legends: on iii. 441, and vi. 106, he makes Baius, the eponymous hero of Baiæ, a companion of Ulysses. Tzetzes, ad Lyc. 694, says that Baius was a pilot of Ulysses, who was buried in Sicily. Steph. Byz, in *Βαΐα*, says that the mountain of Cephallenia, so called, derived its name from Baius, the pilot of Ulysses.

(138) See Strab. v. 4, § 5; Dio Cass. xlviii. 50. Ephorus, ib., places the Cimmerians of the Odyssey in the same neighbourhood (Fragm. 45). The real localities assigned to the Cimmerians were however very various. See Ukert, Geogr. der Gr. und R. iii. 2, p. 360-79: and concerning the passage of Ephorus, p. 376. The belief that Cumæ was the seat of the *νέκυια* of Ulysses is alluded to by Servius, Æn. vi. 106. Compare Klausen, ib. p. 1129. Dio Cassius, ib., thinks that a female statue at Avernum is the statue of Calypso.

(139) Sum patriâ ex Ithacâ, comes infelicis Ulixi,
Nomen Achæmenides.
Æn. iii. 613-4.

(140) Hic quoque substiterat post tædia longa laborum
Neritius Macareus, comes experientis Ulixi.
Met. xiv. 158-9.

Ovid represents Macareus as recognising his former comrade Achæmenides among the followers of Æneas.

(141) Æn. vii. 10-24. Compare Ovid, Met. xiv. 247, 446; Festus, in Saturnia, p. 322. The Scriptor de Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 12, derives the custom of covering the head in sacrificing, from the supposed fact that Æneas, when he was immolating the white sow, was surprised by the fleet of Ulysses, and covered his head for concealment. A different explanation of this custom is given by Macrob. Sat. iii. 6.

(142) Ap. Dion. Hal. i. 72.

to Hades is connected by the ancients with the same Avernus, near Cumæ, which is the scene of the descent of Æneas with the Sibyl.(138) Æneas is likewise described by the Roman poets as finding companions of Ulysses, who had been abandoned by him in his course: thus he meets with one in Virgil who had been left in the cave of the Cyclops;(139) and in Ovid with another who had stayed behind at Cumæ.(140) The Trojan hero is however supposed to sail in safety by the island of Circe, and to hear at a distance the roaring of the enchanted wild beasts; whereas his Grecian predecessor had been here exposed to imminent danger from the charms of the sorceress.(141) In one account ascribed to Hellanicus, Æneas and Ulysses come together to Italy from the country of the Molossians, and found Rome.(142) Even the Argonauts, whose voyage was generally placed in the eastern waters, were not altogether excluded from this mythological kaleidoscope; for, according to the report of

---

Servius ad Æn. ix. 710, mentions both legends: on iii. 441, and vi. 106, he makes Baius, the eponymous hero of Baiæ, a companion of Ulysses. Tzetzes, ad Lyc. 694, says that Baius was a pilot of Ulysses, who was buried in Sicily. Steph. Byz, in Βαία, says that the mountain of Cephallenia, so called, derived its name from Baius, the pilot of Ulysses.

(138) See Strab. v. 4, § 5; Dio Cass. xlviii. 50. Ephorus, ib., places the Cimmerians of the Odyssey in the same neighbourhood (Fragm. 45). The real localities assigned to the Cimmerians were however very various. See Ukert, Geogr. der Gr. und R. iii. 2, p. 360-79: and concerning the passage of Ephorus, p. 376. The belief that Cumæ was the seat of the νέκυια of Ulysses is alluded to by Servius, Æn. vi. 106. Compare Klausen, ib. p. 1129. Dio Cassius, ib., thinks that a female statue at Avernum is the statue of Calypso.

(139) Sum patriâ ex Ithacâ, comes infelicis Ulixi,
Nomen Achæmenides.
Æn. iii. 613-4.

(140) Hic quoque substiterat post tædia longa laborum
Neritius Macareus, comes experientis Ulixi.
Met. xiv. 158-9.

Ovid represents Macareus as recognising his former comrade Achæmenides among the followers of Æneas.

(141) Æn. vii. 10-24. Compare Ovid, Met. xiv. 247, 446; Festus, in Saturnia, p. 322. The Scriptor de Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 12, derives the custom of covering the head in sacrificing, from the supposed fact that Æneas, when he was immolating the white sow, was surprised by the fleet of Ulysses, and covered his head for concealment. A different explanation of this custom is given by Macrob. Sat. iii. 6.

(142) Ap. Dion. Hal. i. 72.

miraculous sources were in their time nearly dried up. Close to this spot were two altars, shown to Dionysius, where Æneas was related to have made his first sacrifice—a thank-offering for the gift of water.(147)

The Trojans are induced to make the Latin coast the term of their wanderings, by the prediction respecting the eating of their tables, which is supposed to be here accidentally fulfilled. The table which they eat, is either the parsley bed on which they are sitting, or the slices of wheaten bread on which their food is laid. As to the prophecy itself, it is variously referred to Venus, to the Oracle of Dodona, to the Erythræan Sibyl, to the Harpies, to Helenus, and to Anchises.(148)

A spot near Laurentum bore the name of Troy, and was supposed to have been the original resting-place of the Trojan exiles. Cato described this Troy as a town, founded by Æneas.(149) Livy compares it with the district, or *pagus*, on the Venetian coast, which was supposed to have taken its name of Troja from Antenor.(150) Similar applications of names of Trojan localities in Epirus, and Egesta, have been already pointed out.(151) This too is the foundation to which Strabo seems to allude, when he describes Æneas as building a city twenty-four stadia from the miraculous sources were in their time nearly dried up. Close to this spot were two altars, shown to Dionysius, where Æneas was related to have made his first sacrifice—a thank-offering for the gift of water.(147)

---

(147) Anna, the sister of Dido, is described as landing on the Laurentian coast, when she rejoins Æneas in Italy; according to the strangely concocted legend, which identifies her with the Latin nymph Anna Perenna; Ovid. Fast. iii. 599; Silius, viii. 68; above, n. 82.

(148) See Virg. Æn. iii. 255-7, 394; vii. 112—29, with Heyne, Exc. viii. ad lib. iii. and Exc. ii. ad lib. vii.; Dion. Hal. i. 55; Varro ap. Serv. Æn. iii. 256; Script. de Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 10-12. Dio Cass. vol. i. p. 4, ed. Bekker. Lycophron, v. 1250; Conon, Narr. 46. Virgil seems to have forgotten, in the seventh book, the denunciation of the Harpies, and the consolatory admonition of Helenus, in the third book. Concerning the prophetic functions of Anchises, see Klausen, p. 1019. One of the origins of the town of Crustumerium referred it to the *crustula panis* eaten by the Trojans; Serv. Æn. vii. 631.

(149) Ap. Serv. Æn. i. 5, vii. 158; conf. ad xi. 316 (Krause, p. 102). See Klausen, p. 810—20. Having mentioned the arrival of Æneas at Laurentum, Appian adds: *ἔνθα καὶ στρατόπεδον αὐτοῦ δείκνυται, καὶ τὴν ἀκτὴν ἀπ' ἐκείνου Τροίαν καλοῦσι.*—Hist. Rom. i. 1.

(150) In quem primum egressi sunt locum, Troja vocatur, pagoque inde Trojano nomen est, gens universa Veneti appellati, i. 1. Steph. Byz. in *Τροία* speaks also both of the Troy in the Venetian and of that in the Latin territory.

(151) Above, p. 313, 318.

The Trojans are induced to make the Latin coast the term of their wanderings, by the prediction respecting the eating of their tables, which is supposed to be here accidentally fulfilled. The table which they eat, is either the parsley bed on which they are sitting, or the slices of wheaten bread on which their food is laid. As to the prophecy itself, it is variously referred to Venus, to the Oracle of Dodona, to the Erythræan Sibyl, to the Harpies, to Helenus, and to Anchises.(148)

A spot near Laurentum bore the name of Troy, and was supposed to have been the original resting-place of the Trojan exiles. Cato described this Troy as a town, founded by Æneas.(149) Livy compares it with the district, or *pagus*, on the Venetian coast, which was supposed to have taken its name of Troja from Antenor.(150) Similar applications of names of Trojan localities in Epirus, and Egesta, have been already pointed out.(151) This too is the foundation to which Strabo seems to allude, when he describes Æneas as building a city twenty-four stadia from the sea, distinct from Lavinium.(152) Other accounts represent Lavinium as the first foundation of Æneas.(153) These legendary stories fluctuate from author to author: not being founded on authentic testimony, they did not admit of being reduced to any fixed standard.

---

(147) Anna, the sister of Dido, is described as landing on the Laurentian coast, when she rejoins Æneas in Italy; according to the strangely concocted legend, which identifies her with the Latin nymph Anna Perenna; Ovid. Fast. iii. 599; Silius, viii. 68; above, n. 82.

(148) See Virg. Æn. iii. 255-7, 394; vii. 112—29, with Heyne, Exc. viii. ad lib. iii. and Exc. ii. ad lib. vii.; Dion. Hal. i. 55; Varro ap. Serv. Æn. iii. 256; Script. de Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 10-12. Dio Cass. vol. i. p. 4, ed. Bekker. Lycophron, v. 1250; Conon, Narr. 46. Virgil seems to have forgotten, in the seventh book, the denunciation of the Harpies, and the consolatory admonition of Helenus, in the third book. Concerning the prophetic functions of Anchises, see Klausen, p. 1019. One of the origins of the town of Crustumerium referred it to the *crustula panis* eaten by the Trojans; Serv. Æn. vii. 631.

(149) Ap. Serv. Æn. i. 5, vii. 158; conf. ad xi. 316 (Krause, p. 102). See Klausen, p. 810—20. Having mentioned the arrival of Æneas at Laurentum, Appian adds: ἔνθα καὶ στρατόπεδον αὐτοῦ δείκνυται, καὶ τὴν ἀκτὴν ἀπ' ἐκείνου Τροίαν καλοῦσι.—Hist. Rom. i. 1.

(150) In quem primum egressi sunt locum, Troja vocatur, pagoque inde Trojano nomen est. gens universa Veneti appellati, i. 1. Steph. Byz. in Τροία speaks also both of the Troy in the Venetian and of that in the Latin territory.

(151) Above, p. 313, 318.

Another oracular warning which Æneas had received, directed him to choose a quadruped for his guide, and wherever it stopped, to build a city.(154) During the celebration of his first religious rites, a pregnant sow had escaped from the hands of the sacrificers, and did not rest until she had reached a small eminence twenty-four stadia, or three miles, from the sea-shore. While he is doubting whether this barren spot would be suitable for his new settlement,(155) he hears a voice from the thicket, which admonishes him to establish himself in this place—for that his descendants will acquire much fertile land, and rule over a great empire; and that in as many years, as the sow produces young, they will found a large and flourishing city.(156) Another account represented this revelation as having been made to him in a vision by a divine being. 'Which of those versions is true (says Dionysius), the gods alone know.'(157) On the next day,

---

(152) v. 3, § 2. This account seems to be confused; for Dionysius, i. 56, describes the site of Lavinium as distant twenty-four stadia from the sea.

(153) Dio Cass. ubi sup.

(154) Dion. Hal. i. 55.

(155) Tum Æneas ægre patiebatur in eum devenisse agrum, macerrimum littorosissimumque; Fabius Maximus, ap. Serv. ad Æn. i. 7. See Krause, Fragm. Hist. Rom. p. 170.

(156) This account of Dionysius exactly agrees with that of Cato, ap. Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 12. Cato describes the supernatural warning as having been given him by the Penates during his sleep. Virgil, in like manner, supposes a prophecy to have been uttered by Faunus in the Albunean grove to King Latinus, in which the future empire of Rome is predicted:

Ne pete connubiis natam sociare Latinis,
O mea progenies, thalamis neu crede paratis.
Externi venient generi, qui sanguine nostrum
Nomen in astra ferant, quorumque ab stirpe nepotes
Omnia sub pedibus, qua Sol utrumque recurrens
Aspicit Oceanum, vertique regique videbunt.
Æn. vii. 96—101.

A dream of Rhea Silvia, prophetic of the greatness of Rome, is related in Ovid, Fast. iii. 27—38. With the prophecies of the greatness of Rome, to Æneas, compare the prophecy of Romulus to Proculus Julius, in Livy, i. 16.

(157) Fabius Pictor mentioned the omen of the white sow, and the divine

Hearing that a part of his territory is occupied by a body of strangers, he takes alarm, draws off his forces from the Rutulian campaign, and marches against the Trojans. A hostile encounter is however prevented by the timely interposition of the gods. Latinus is warned in his sleep by a native deity to admit the Trojans as settlers in his territory: Æneas receives a similar admonition not to engage with the army of Latinus.(161) After a colloquy between the two chieftains,(162) a treaty is concluded, by which the Aborigines grant to the Trojans forty stadia of land in every direction from the hill which they have occupied; and the Trojans undertake to assist the Aborigines against the Rutuli. Hereupon, the two armies unite, march against the Rutuli, and defeat them. They then return, and Æneas completes the walls of his newly-founded town, which he names Lavinium, either from Lavinia, the daughter of Latinus, according to the Roman account, or, according to some Greek mythographers, from Launa, the daughter of Anius, who dies and is buried here.(163)

The birth of the thirty swine was not the only prodigy which attended the foundation of Lavinium. A fire having arisen spontaneously in the neighbouring grove, a wolf was seen to bring dry wood to feed it, and an eagle fanned it with his wings; but a fox endeavoured to counteract their efforts, by dipping his tail in the river, and sprinkling water upon the flames. The exertions of the fox, though well sustained, were however in the end fruitless; and Æneas, having witnessed the omen, interpreted it to mean that the new colony would struggle against great difficulties and the jealousy of neighbours, but would at last by the aid of the gods prevail against the opposition of men. Brazen statues of these animals, of great antiquity, were preserved in the forum of Lavinium, at the time of Dionysius, as memorials of this significant omen.(164) Most of the temples and other buildings, with which Æneas adorned the town of Lavinium, were likewise extant in his time.(165) So firmly established was the belief in the Trojan origin of Lavinium, and of the Penates which were there preserved, that this town is said to have alone resisted the arms of Coriolanus, on account of its peculiar affinity with Rome, while the Romans, on their part, were seized with consternation on hearing that it was besieged by the Volscians.(166) It was moreover the constant usage, in the historical age, for consuls, prætors, and dictators, on entering their office, to sacrifice to Vesta and the Penates, at Lavinium, as being the ancient hereditary seat of the Roman people.(167) Tatius, the colleague of Romulus, was likewise reported to have been slain at Lavinium, while he was performing there the sacred rites appertaining to his kingly office.(168)

---

(161) i. 57.

(162) The speeches made on this occasion are set out at length by Dionysius, i. 58. They are written in Thucydidean style. Æneas apologizes for his intrusive descent on the territory of Latinus, on the ground of necessity, subjoining the apophthegm: *ἅπαν δὲ συγγνώμης ἄξιον τὸ ἀκούσιον.*

(163) i. 59. In the beginning of the Æneid, Æneas is said to come to the *Lavinia littora*, by an anticipation. The foundation of Lavinium is not included in the action of the poem. Servius, in his note on Æn. i. 2, as elsewhere, confounds Laurentum and Lavinium. Latinus is introduced in a wholly different character into a foundation legend of the city of Locri, which is related by Conon, Narr. 3. Alcinous and Locrus are the sons of Phæax, king of Scheria (or Corcyra). A quarrel takes place between the brothers; whereupon Locrus settles in Italy, and marries Lavinia, the daughter of King Latinus. Shortly afterwards Hercules arrives in Italy, with the oxen of Geryones from Erythea, and is hospitably entertained by Locrus. Latinus, being on a visit to his daughter, sees the oxen, admires them, and drives some of them away: but Hercules discovers the theft, and kills Latinus with an arrow. In this story, Latinus fills the place of Cacus, and steals the oxen of Hercules. Moreover Locrus marries Lavinia, the daughter of Latinus, and acquires Locri: instead of Æneas marrying Lavinia, the daughter of Latinus, and acquiring Lavinium. Locri in Italy seems to have been founded by the Ozolian Locrians in the seventh century B.C. See Strab .vi. 1, § 7; Clinton ad ann. 673.

---

(164) i. 59. This prediction, of the greatness of Rome, is similar to that which Æneas hears from the voice in the thicket, above, p. 333.

(165) *Αἰνείας δὲ κατασκευάσας ἱεροῖς τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις κόσμοις ἀποχρώντως τὴν πόλιν, ὧν τὰ πλεῖστα ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἦν*, &c. i. 64. In later times, Laurentum and Lavinium, on account of their depopulation, were consolidated, under the name of Lauro-Lavinium: see Cramer's Ancient Italy, vol. ii. p. 16; Klausen, p. 791; Bormann, ib. p. 102.

(166) Dion. Hal. viii. 21; Plutarch Coriol. 29. Compare Varro de L. L. v. § 144. 'Oppidum, quod primum conditum in Latio stirpis Romanæ, Lavinium; nam ibi dii penates nostri. Hoc a Latini filiâ, quæ conjuncta Æneæ, Laviniâ, appellatum. Hinc post triginta annos oppidum alterum conditum Alba; id ab sue albâ nominatum. Hæc e navi Æneæ quum fugisset Lavinium, triginta parit porcos; ex hoc prodigio post Lavinium conditum annis triginta hæc urbs facta, propter colorem suis et loci naturam Alba Longa dicta.' Also Solin. ii. 13. An etymological legend in Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 12, derives the name of Lavinium from *lavo;* because Æneas bathed in a salt-marsh close to it. A derivation of the name from the brother of Latinus is mentioned in Serv. ad Æn. i. 2. Lycophron, like Varro, speaks of the sow as having been brought in the ship of Æneas;

συὸς κελαινῆς, ἣν ἀπ' Ἰδαίων λόφων,
καὶ Δαρδανείων ἐκ τόπων ναυσθλώσεται.—v. 1255-6.

A close alliance is now formed between Æneas and the Aborigines; Latinus gives his daughter in marriage to Æneas, and his subjects are called Latins.(169) This name is afterwards extended to the Trojans, when, upon the death of Latinus, Æneas succeeds to his kingdom, in right of his wife Lavinia. For Turnus, a kinsman of Amata, the queen of Latinus, had, out of jealousy, placed himself at the head of the revolted Rutuli; and in the war which ensued, both Latinus and Turnus were killed, but the victory was achieved by Æneas. His joint reign, over both Latins and Trojans, lasted for three years after the death of Latinus; in the fourth he was slain, in a war against Mezentius and the Tuscans.(170)

---

(167) See Macrob. Sat. iii. 4; Serv. ad Æn. ii. 296. Some actual examples of this practice are cited by Klausen, p. 621. Strabo speaks of the continuance of the ancient sacrifices in the Latin towns, which had been handed down from the time of Æneas. *λείπεται μὲν ἴχνη πόλεων, ἔνδοξα δὲ διὰ τὴν Αἰνείου γέγονεν ἐπιδημίαν, καὶ τὰς ἱεροποιίας ἐξ ἐκείνων τῶν χρόνων παραδεδόσθαι φασί.*—iii. 3, § 5.

(168) Dion. Hal. ii. 52; Livy, i. 14; Plut. Rom. 23.

(169) Dion. Hal. i. 60. According to Strab. v. 3, § 2, the subjects of Æneas received the name of Latins, *after* the death of Latinus. The same account is given by Livy: 'Æneas, adversus tanti belli terrorem ut animos Aboriginum sibi conciliaret, ne sub eodem jure solum, sed etiam nomine, omnes essent, Latinos utramque gentem appellavit.' i. 2. The prevalence of the Latin name, and the non-recognition of the Trojans in any national appellative in Italy, is thus accounted for by Virgil. Juno, seeing that the cause of Æneas must prevail, makes the following entreaty to Jupiter:

Ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos,
Neu Troas fieri jubeas, Teucrosque vocari,
Aut vocem mutare viros, aut vertere vestes.
Sit Latium, sint Albani per secula reges;
Sit Romana potens Italâ virtute propago;
Occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troja.

To which Jupiter replies:

Do quod vis, et me victusque volensque remitto.
Sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt,
Utque est, nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum
Subsident Teucri. Morem ritusque sacrorum
Adjiciam, faciamque omnes uno ore Latinos.
xii. 823—37.

This passage is inconsistent with the view of Dionysius, Livy, and Strabo, which represents the name of Latins as substituted for that of Aborigines in the time of Æneas.

From this narrative the accounts of Livy and of the writer of the work on the origin of the Romans do not materially differ.(171) According to Livy, there were two versions of the result of the first meeting between Æneas and Latinus: one represented the alliance and the subsequent marriage as the result of a battle and defeat, the other as the fruits of a voluntary agreement. The foundation of Lavinium moreover in both these accounts succeeds the marriage, instead of preceding it. The narrative of Strabo, though brief, agrees in the main with those of the Roman historians: he describes Lavinium however as the foundation not of Æneas, but of Latinus.(172)

In the Æneid, these events are represented in a somewhat different light. Latinus, having first given a favourable answer to the ambassadors of Æneas, is afterwards reluctantly drawn into a war against him. This affords an opportunity for the introduction of Evander, as the ally of Æneas; whereas, according to the scheme of Dionysius, Evander belongs to the previous generation, and is the cotemporary of Hercules and Faunus. Mezentius and his son Lausus are slain in combat by Æneas; instead of dying in battle against Ascanius. Æneas fights with Turnus for the hand of Lavinia,(173) and his marriage with the daughter of Latinus does not take place until he has slain his rival in single combat.

The account of Cato seems to have resembled the first version mentioned by Livy; for he described Æneas as fighting a battle, soon after his arrival, against Latinus and Turnus, in which Latinus falls, but Turnus escapes. Turnus is afterwards joined by Mezentius; and in this second campaign both Æneas and

---

(170) i. 64.

(171) Livy, i. 1-2. Script. de Orig. Gent. Rom. c. 13-4.

(172) v. 3, § 2. Strabo does not mention the marriage of Æneas and Lavinia.

(173)
Vicisti, et victum tendere palmas
Ausonii videre: tua est Lavinia conjux,
Ulterius ne tende odiis.—Æn. xii. 936-8.

Turnus are killed: Mezentius surviving to be defeated by the arms of Ascanius.(174)

The account of Appian represents Faunus, the son of Mars, as king of the Aborigines when Æneas arrives in Latium. He gives Æneas his daughter Lavinia in marriage, and an allotment of land three stadia in circuit. Æneas builds a city, and names it Lavinium, after his wife: upon the death of Faunus, he succeeds to his kingdom, and calls the people Latins, in honour of Faunus, who was of Latin origin. Afterwards, he is killed by the king of the Rutulians, who was jealous of him on account of his marriage with the daughter of Faunus.(175) Latinus is entirely wanting in this version of the story.

§ 10 The death of Æneas was narrated in two ways, one marvellous, the other natural. According to the former,(176) he perished in the river Numicius, which washed away his mortal parts, and left only the ethereal substance;(177) according to the latter, he was drowned in that river during the battle with Mezentius, and his body was never found. He received divine honours, under the appellation of *Pater Indiges;* and a monument to him, on the spot, with a commemorative inscription, was extant in the time of Dionysius.(178)

---

(174) This report of Cato's account is given by Servius in three places: on Æn. i. 267; iv. 620; ix. 745. Krause, p. 99—102. It is however inconsistent with his other reports of Cato's testimony: thus, on vi. 760, he says that Cato represented Æneas as obtaining the hand of Lavinia, as soon as he arrives; whereupon Turnus makes war both on Latinus and Æneas. Again, on xi. 316, he quotes Cato as stating that the Trojans received 700 jugera of land, between Laurentum and the Castra Trojana, from Latinus. Such a voluntary gift is irreconcilable with the previous passages.

(175) Hist. Rom. i. 1.

(176) The numerous passages on the apotheosis of Æneas are collected by Klausen, p. 901-2. See particularly Dion. Hal. i. 64; Livy, i. 2; Virg. Æn. xii. 794, with the note of Servius. Tibull. ii. 5. 43; Ovid. Met. xiv. 581—608. This apotheosis was supposed to be effected by water, as that of Hercules was by fire: the purifying element being different, but the result the same.

(177) According to another story, Æneas was taken up into heaven, during the battle, in the midst of a thunderstorm, which darkened the earth. Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 14. The circumstances resemble those of the death of Romulus.

(178) i. 64. Compare Schol. Ver. Æn. i. 260; Festus, in Indiges, p. 106.

The principal worship traced up to Æneas, was that of the Penates, whose images were supposed to have been brought by him from Troy.(179) The *parentalia*, likewise, or the rites performed to the souls of departed parents, were said to have originated with Æneas, who was the mythical type of filial piety.(180)

Dionysius cautions his readers against being disturbed by the fact that numerous tombs of Æneas were shown in different countries, although (as he truly remarks) it is impossible for the same person to be buried in more than one place. He bids us remember the celebrity of Æneas, and the length of his voyage; which would naturally cause the erection of cenotaphs to his memory in many places.(181) This explanation however overlooks the circumstance, that each one of these monuments was considered as his tomb; just as each one of the sacred Tunics, preserved in different Catholic churches, was considered the genuine relic. Anchises likewise, as well as his son, was honoured with numerous tombs. A tomb of Anchises was shown on Mount Ida, which the herdsmen annually crowned with chaplets.(182) Others were to be seen at Ænea in Thrace, at Pydna,(183) and at Mount Anchisia, near the Arcadian Orchomenos;(184) Diomede was moreover said to have dug up the bones of Anchises, and to have restored them to Æneas.(185) The inhabitants of Anchiasmus affirmed that Anchises there disappeared from among mankind, and gave his name to the town.(186) Virgil represents Anchises as dying at Eryx; and the games in the fifth book of the Æneid are celebrated in honour of his memory.(187) Other accounts carried him as far as Italy; and supposed him to die in the land assigned by the Fates to his descendants.(188)

---

(179) The Palladium of Troy was also believed to have been brought from Troy by Æneas to Italy, and to have been afterwards deposited in the Capitol: see Dion. Hal. i. 68-9; Paus. ii. 22, § 5; Plut. Camill. 20; Serv. Æn. ii. 166. Compare Klausen, p. 159. In Virgil, the shade of Hector thus addresses Æneas:

> Sacra suosque tibi commendat Troja penates;
> Hos cape fatorum comites; his mœnia quære,
> Magna pererrato statues quæ denique ponto.
> Æn. ii. 293-5.
>
> Huc melius profugos misisti, Troja, penates.
> O quali ducta est Dardana puppis ave.
> Propert. iv. 1, 39-40.

Other passages are collected by Klausen, p. 657. According to Atticus, the Penates were brought not from Troy, but from Samothrace; Schol. Veron. ad Æn. ii. 717.

(180)
> Hunc morem Æneas, *pietatis idoneus auctor*,
> Attulit in terras, juste Latine, tuas.
> Ille patris genio sollennia dona ferebat:
> Hinc populi ritus edidicere pios.
> Ovid. Fast. ii. 541-4.

(181) *εἰ δέ τινας ταράττοι τὸ πολλαχῇ λέγεσθαί τε καὶ δείκνυσθαι τάφους Αἰνείου, ἀμηχάνου ὄντος ἐν πλείοσι τὸν αὐτὸν τεθάφθαι χωρίοις.*—&c. i. 54. 'Nothing (remarks Klausen) riveted a hero so closely to the place of his worship, as his tomb.' p. 543.

§ 11 Some instances of the national recognition of Æneas, as leader of the Trojan colony to Latium, (such as the sympathy with Lavinium in the war of Coriolanus, and the preservation of the palladium during the Gallic conflagration) occur in the early history.(189) The first example however to which we can attach much weight is that of Pyrrhus, who is reported to have been strengthened in his desire to make war against the Romans, by remembering that while he was a descendant of Achilles, they were descendants of the Trojans.(190) A Trojan colony in Latium had also been recognised by Aristotle, and Timæus, whose history ended in 264 B.C., mentioned the existence of Trojan relics at Lavinium, but did not expressly connect them with Æneas.(191) The Egestans, in the early part of the First Punic War (263 B.C.), gave a very practical proof of their belief in the Trojan origin of Rome;(192) and this article of the national creed was incorporated in the poem of Nævius upon the same war. Several public acts of the Romans, in relation to the Acarnanians, to Seleucus, and to the Ilienses, of somewhat later date, implied the same assumption.(193) In the Second Punic War, the prophecy of Marcius gave to the Romans the epithet of *Trojugenæ*.(194) Indeed, if the testimonies of Hellanicus and Damastes have been correctly reported to us, the foundation of Rome by Æneas was a legend adopted by the early Greek historians.(195)

---

(182) Eustath. ad. Il. xii. p. 894.

(183) Steph. Byz. in *Αἰνεία*; Conon, Narr. 46; Tzetz. Lyc. 1263; Schol. Iliad. xiii. 459. Compare Klausen, p. 343, 346.

(184) Pausan. viii. 12, § 9, in describing this tomb, says that the Æolians at Troy could not show any tomb of Anchises—but this is inconsistent with the testimony of Eustathius quoted above.

(185) Serv. ad Æn. iv. 427; v. 80. See Klausen, p. 445.

(186) Procop. de Bell. Goth. iv. 22. See Klausen, p. 426.

(187) Hinc Drepani me portus et illætabilis ora
Accipit. Hic, pelagi tot tempestatibus actus,
Heu genitorem, omnis curæ casusque levamen,
Amitto Anchisen.—Æn. iii. 707-10.

Compare v. 59-60; 81-3; Ovid. Met. xiv. 84.

(188) See Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 10, 11. Cato brought Anchises to Italy; Serv. Æn. i. 570; iv. 427. According to some authors, the monument near the Numicius was the tomb, not of Æneas, but of Anchises, erected by Æneas. Dion. Hal. i. 64. The words of Strabo, v 3, § 2, are not quite distinct, but he seems to assume that Anchises died in Italy. A town in Italy named Anchise, after Anchises, is mentioned in Dion. Hal. i. 73. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 600, conjectures that the name was formed from Anxur: his conjecture is however disapproved by Klausen, ib. p. 1036. The word Ἀγχισεῖσι in Dion. Hal. i. 74 (written Ἀγχιστεῖσι in the Vat. MSS.) has been altered into ἀρχιερεῦσι by Niebuhr, ib. note 656; but the emendation (though received by Bekker in his edition of Polybius, vol. i. p. 496) is uncertain.

(189) Above, p. 336 and n. 179.

§ 12 An attempt has been made, and supported with much learning and ingenuity, to explain the legend of Æneas in Latium, by the affinity of the Gergithian Sibyl in Asia Minor with the Cuman Sibyl in Italy, and by a consequent transfer of Trojan legends from one district to the other.(196) The great antiquity and early importance of the Hellenic settlement of Cumæ on the Italian coast, and its connexion with the Æolian Cuma in Asia Minor, may reasonably be supposed to have made it a centre from which the Greek mythology, including the legends specially connected with the Sibyls, was diffused in this region. But Æneas was not the only hero whose adventures were localized on the coasts of Southern Italy and its adjoining islands. This entire region was full of supposed reminiscences of Ulysses, Diomed, and other Trojan heroes.(197) Even Thucydides speaks of Eryx and Egesta having been colonized by a joint body of Trojans and Phocians, after the capture of Troy. Cumæ itself was as much noted for the visit of Ulysses, as for that of Æneas, to its Sibyl; and the whole of this coast was identified with some of the most celebrated adventures of the Odyssey. Some more general cause, than the connexion of the Cuman and Gergithian Sibyls, must be sought for these phenomena; and the true explanation is doubtless to be found in the extraordinary popularity and early diffusion of the Homeric poems, and in the magic influence which they exercised upon the Greek mind.(198) It is impossible for us now to discover in every case the precise accident, or association of ideas, which dictated the choice of one Trojan hero, rather than another, as the mythical founder of a town; but when once a belief in the presence of Æneas in Latium had been established, it would naturally be developed, confirmed, and diffused by the growth of the Roman power, the interests of certain Greek cities, the national vanity of the Romans, and the cultivation of their literature.

---

(190) *ταῦτα λεγόντων τῶν πρεσβέων μνήμη τὸν Πύρρον τῆς ἁλώσεως ἐσῆλθε τῆς Ἰλίου, καὶ οἱ κατὰ ταὐτὰ ἤλπιζε χωρήσειν πολεμοῦντι· στρατεύσειν γὰρ ἐπὶ Τρώων ἀποίκους Ἀχιλλέως ὢν ἀπόγονος.*—Paus. i. 12, § 1. The actions of Pyrrhus were chronicled by contemporary Greek writers. The excellent contemporary inscription upon the arms of the Gauls dedicated by Pyrrhus in the temple of the Itonian Minerva, proves that his Æacid blood, and his descent from Achilles, were as much established topics among his eulogists, as the descent from Æneas and Iulus was among the flatterers of Augustus. See Pausan. i. 13, § 2; Plut. Pyrrh. 26; Anth. Pal. vi. 130.

(191) Dion. Hal. i. 67. Timæus, in his history of Pyrrhus, likewise interpreted the Roman custom of sacrificing a war-horse, in the Campus Martius, as an allusion to the wooden horse by which Troy was taken. Ap. Polyb. xii. 4a. vol. ii. p. 728, ed. Bekker (Fragm. 151, ed. Didot). Compare Plutarch Q. Rom. 97; Festus, in October equus, p. 178, with the comments of Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 185; Klausen, p. 825. It is therefore quite certain that the Trojan origin of Rome, if not the legend of Æneas, was fully recognised in the writings of Timæus.

(192) Above, p. 319.

(193) See above, p. 313; Klausen, ib. p. 601; Wachsmuth Aelt. Gesch. der Röm. Staats, p. 106.

(194) See Livy, xxv. 12.

(195) See Dion. Hal. i. 72; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 66. The genuineness of the poem of Lycophron, or at least of the passages relating to Rome, is too doubtful to admit of its being quoted as chronological evidence. See Bernhardy, Gr. Litt. vol. ii. p. 1027.

---

(196) See Otfried Müller, in the Classical Journal, vol. xxvi. p. 316. Dorians, b. ii. c. 2, § 4. Klausen, ib. p. 307—12, 549. Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. i. p. 457; iii. p. 472.

(197) Many of these are enumerated by Mr. Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. i. p. 424, who remarks that 'it was particularly among the Italian Greeks, where they were worshipped with very special solemnity, that their presence as wanderers from Troy was reputed and believed.' Several of them are to be found in Pseud-Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 106—110.

(198) Col. Mure calls attention to the fact that not only the early epic poets, but even the logographers of Greece, confined themselves within the circle of legends anterior to the return of the Heraclidæ, and rarely alluded to the subsequent period; Hist. of Gr. Lit. vol. iv. p. 59—67. The main cause of this singular restriction seems to have been the influence of the Homeric poems, and the overwhelming celebrity which they gave to the heroes and consequences of the Trojan war. Compare Grote, vol. ii. p. 43—6. The following remarks, by Col. Mure, on the obscurity of Ithaca after the mythical brilliancy

§ 13 Dionysius narrates at length the expedition of Æneas from Troy to Latium, and regards it as a perfectly authentic history, not less certain than the campaigns of Hannibal or Cæsar. He admits indeed that there are perplexing discrepancies of evidence; but he is studious to eliminate all the marvellous incidents of the story; and he seeks to remove all obstacles to the reader's entire faith in the substance of the narrative. Livy, in his preface, speaks doubtingly of the credibility of the history anterior to the foundation of the city: but his account of the voyage of Æneas shows no signs of scepticism, and he appears to treat it as well established matter of fact.(199) That the Romans were of Trojan origin, and that

---

of the period described in the Odyssey, are applicable, though in a less degree, to the ante-historical ages of other parts of Greece. 'Another powerful ingredient of the interest that attaches to this little rock, is the complete obscurity into which it retires, immediately after the genius to which it was indebted for its celebrity becomes extinct, and in which it has remained during the three thousand years that have since elapsed. After the age of its great mythological warrior and of his poet, neither its prosperity nor its misfortunes seem to have attracted the smallest attention beyond its own bounds. We neither know by what race it was inhabited—what was its form of government—or whether it was free, or subject to its neighbours. So much as the name of Ithaca scarcely occurs in the page of any writer of historical ages, unless with reference to its mythical celebrity. Here, therefore, all our recollections are concentrated solely around the heroic age. Every hill and rock, every fountain and olive grove, breathes Homer and the Odyssey.'—Journal of a Tour in Greece, vol. i. p. 38.

(199) Quæ ante conditam condendamve urbem, poeticis magis decora fabulis, quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis, traduntur, ea nec affirmare nec refellere in animo est; Præf. But at the outset of his history he speaks of the exception made in favour of Æneas and Antenor, after the capture of Troy, by the victorious Greeks, as a certain fact: 'Jam primum omnium *satis constat*, Trojâ captâ, in cæteros sævitum esse Trojanos.' He does not venture to decide, on account of the remoteness of the time, whether Ascanius was the son of Creusa or of Lavinia; but he considers it beyond a doubt that he was the son of Æneas: 'certe natum

Æneas was their primitive founder, was (as we have seen) an article of the national belief, traceable, on satisfactory evidence, at least as high as the time of Pyrrhus. Modern historians of Rome have adopted the same view. Thus Hooke admits the connexion of Æneas with Rome as a fact ;(200) and the authors of a recent German history of Rome, writing with all the lights and resources supplied by the criticism of the last hundred years, compare the settlement of Æneas in Latium with the conquest of Mexico by Cortes, and treat it as equally historical.(201)

The Abbé Banier, the author of a detailed work on the historical explanation of the Greek and Roman mythology, which in the last century enjoyed a high character, is disposed in this instance to depart from his customary method of interpretation, and to reject altogether the expedition of Æneas to Italy, instead of regarding it as a nucleus of truth invested with a fabulous covering. His reason for adopting this bold course is, that he considers Homer a more credible witness, as being nearer the time and the country of Æneas than the other mythologers; and he understands Homer to speak of Æneas and his de-

---

Æneâ constat.' (i. 3). He also knows that exactly thirty years intervened between the foundations of Lavinium and Alba Longa; ib. Florus, Dio Cassius, and Appian equally accept the Latin colony of Æneas. Sallust. Cat. 6, appears to treat Æneas and his Trojans as the founders of Rome itself. The Trojan colony in Latium was fully recognised by Cato; Krause, p. 99—103. Orosius, who was born towards the end of the fourth century, describes himself as having learnt the legend of Æneas in Italy at school. 'Paucis præterea annis intervenientibus, Æneæ, Trojâ profugi, adventus in Italiam quæ arma commoverit, qualia per triennium bella excitaverit, quantos populos implicuerit, odio excidioque afflixerit, ludi litterarii disciplinâ nostræ quoque memoriæ inustum est.' Hist. i. 18. The *triennium* appears to allude to Virg. Æn. i. 263—6.

(200) 'That Æneas came into Italy after the destruction of Troy, and that the founders of Rome were descended from him and his followers, are points of history sufficiently authorized and established. All the Latin historians either expressly relate these facts or suppose them; and many of the Greek, less zealous for the Roman glory, adhere to the same tradition.' Rom. Hist. b. i. c. 1.

(201) See Gerlach and Bachofen, Gesch. der Römer, vol. i. part i. p. 159—88. In p. 172 they say that the families of the Trojan conquerors were as well known in the time of Varro, as at present the Norman barons are in England, or the families of the Conquistadores are in Mexico. In p. 180 they remark that Cortes conquered Mexico with not more companions than Cassius Hemina attributes to Æneas: viz. 600. See Krause, p. 158.

scendants as continuing to reign over the Trojans in their own country.(202) Niebuhr and other modern inquirers have analyzed the legend of Æneas in Latium; but with a view rather of discovering its origin, than of searching for a foundation of fact, or of treating it as a question of credible evidence.(203)

The voyage of Æneas from Troy to Italy, and his establishment in Latium (constituting, as they do, the main action of the Æneid), have been investigated with great diligence and acuteness, and with a profusion of appropriate learning, by modern critical inquirers. Even, however, the most acute and the most learned of these writers have perhaps insulated the subject too much, and have separated it unduly from other portions of the Greek mythology with which it is indissolubly connected. In order to form a correct appreciation of the legends respecting the wanderings of Æneas, we ought to combine them with the legends respecting the wanderings of the other heroes, both Greek and Trojan, which ensued upon the capture of Troy, and even with the expedition of the Argonauts. Some of these may be more or less marvellous than others; some may sin more or less than others against the canons of internal probability; but in respect of external evidence they all stand on a level. All are equally destitute of credible attestation. They are referred to a time which is centuries before any trace of historical registration; they can be connected with no authentic oral tradition and no determinate witness. They are unsupported by any basis for rational belief.

---

(202) See Banier, La Mythologie et les Fables expliquées par l'Histoire, Liv. vi. c. 6. (Paris. 1764). After quoting the prophecy in the Iliad, he proceeds thus: 'Ainsi tout ce que les historiens ont écrit du voyage d'Énée en Italie pourroit étre regardé comme un roman, uniquement fait pour detruire toute verité historique, puisque le plus ancien d'eux est postérieur à Homère de plusieurs siècles, pendant que ce poète vivoit 260 ans seulement, ou environ, après la prise de Troie, et qu'il écrivoit dans quelques unes des villes d'Ionie, voisine, ou peu éloignée de la Phrygie.' (Tom. vii. p. 409.)

(203) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 180. Dr. Schmitz, in his History of Rome, has the following remarks: 'The tradition of the Trojan colony in Latium is the more important, as it stands in direct connexion with the stories about the foundation of Rome. It should not indeed be regarded in any other light than as a fiction; but it cannot be passed over unnoticed, forming as it does the direct road to the earliest part of Roman story.' p. 13.

If any one of these legendary voyages is entitled to acceptance as a real fact, it would seem that the voyage of Ulysses has the best claim to credit. Some of the ancients indeed treated the adventures described in the Odyssey as a tissue of fables; thus the celebrated geographer Eratosthenes remarked that it would be as easy to determine the course of Ulysses, as to discover the name of the man who sewed up the bag of the winds.(204) But this was an extent of scepticism not approved by some of the most judicious writers of antiquity. Polybius thought that the voyage of Ulysses was founded on fact, though embellished with wonderful tales.(205) Strabo supports this view; maintaining that Homer adorned truth with fiction, but that there was always a foundation of fact, and that to invent everything was contrary to his practice.(206) Homer lived nearer the time of the supposed Trojan war, and of the returns of the heroes, than the authors of the legends respecting the voyage of Æneas; and although the Odyssey abounds in marvels, yet the story of Æneas is essentially extra-natural, and is built upon suppositions inconsistent with the most liberal canon of probability; such, for example, as his birth from the goddess Venus.(207) Unless therefore we are prepared to admit the existence of a historical foundation, not only for the adventures of Ulysses, but also for the wanderings of the other heroes on their return from Troy, and even for the voyage of the Argonauts, we must reject the hypothesis that the expedition of Æneas to Latium contains a nucleus of truth.

---

(204) Strab. i. 2, § 15. The allusion is to Od. x. 19. Eratosthenes thought that the poems of Homer were not to be reduced to a rational standard, and that history was not to be sought in them—*κελεύων μὴ κρίνειν πρὸς τὴν διάνοιαν τὰ ποιήματα, μηδ' ἱστορίαν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ζητεῖν.*—ib. § 17. There is a curious essay, (included in Westermann's Mythographi, p. 329), in which the stories of the Odyssey are allegorized on ethical principles, and all the marvels are rationalized for a moral, not a historical, purpose. In Heraclides, Alleg. Hom. c. 70-1, ed. Schow. the adventures of Ulysses during his voyage are also allegorized. Thus the burning of the eye of the Cyclops, means that evil passions are extirpated by reason; the command of the winds possessed by Æolus, means that by his knowledge of the stars he could guide a ship: Charybdis signifies insatiable gluttony; Scylla denotes shamelessness, &c. The story of Scylla is rationalized in Palæphatus de Incred. c. 21, which explanation is referred to by Euseb. Chron. p. 311, ed. Mai.

(205) Ap. Strab. i. 2, § 15—18. Polybius held that the entire voyage of Ulysses was not fabulous: *ἀλλὰ μικρὰ μὲν προσμεμυθεῦσθαι, καθάπερ καὶ τῷ Ἰλιακῷ πολέμῳ.*—§ 15.

(206) Strabo. i. 2, § 9, lays it down that Homer, having received the traditions of the Trojan war, and the wanderings of Ulysses, embellished them with fables, *ἐκ μηδενὸς δ' ἀληθοῦς ἀνάπτειν καινὴν τερατολογίαν οὐχ Ὁμηρικόν.* In § 17, a similar remark is cited from Polybius: *τὸ δὲ πάντα πλάττειν οὐ πιθανὸν οὐδ' Ὁμηρικόν.* In § 13, Strabo says that minute accuracy is not to be expected from Homer's descriptions of places, but that they are founded on a general knowledge of the geography. See also Lactant. Div. Inst. i. 11. Syncellus, in registering the events of A.M. 4331, places the reign of Æneas at Lavinium and the adventures of Ulysses in his voyage on the same footing. *Αἰνείας τε ἐβασίλευε Λαβινίου. Τὰ κατὰ Ὀδυσσέα καὶ Σκύλλαν καὶ Χάρυβδιν καὶ Σειρῆνας.*—vol. i. p. 326 ed. Bonn.

---

(207) As those writers who refuse to recognise a historical basis in the legends of the Greek Mythology are sometimes reproached with the lowering tone of their criticism, and with their insensibility to the poetical beauty of the ancient traditions, it may not be out of place to cite some examples of the manner in which these graceful fictions have been handled by approved critics of the opposite school. The Abbé Banier, in narrating the history of Æneas, says that if we are to believe the majority of the ancients, the goddess Venus was his mother. 'Il n'y a rien de si fameux parmi les poètes que le commerce d'Anchise avec cette déesse; mais apparemment que cette fable fut inventée pour cacher quelque galanterie, *et calmer la jalousie de la femme d'Anchise*, qui le voyoit aller trop souvent sur les bords du fleuve Simois, où il etoit apparemment devenu sensible aux charmes de quelque bergère, qui fut peut-être appellée Venus à cause de sa beauté.' La Myth. expl. par l'Histoire, liv. vi. c. 6; vol. vii. p. 396. A similar view is adopted by Hooke, in his Roman History: 'Such was the end (he says) of Æneas, the Trojan Prince so much celebrated by the Greek and Latin poets, and who, *because he was illegitimate*, and born of a mother remarkable for her beauty, was, agreeable to the manner of speaking in those times, called the son of Venus.' b. i. c. 1. Bayle, Dict. art. Anchise, does not attempt to explain away the maternity of Venus, but he seems to treat Anchises as a historical personage; and he remarks that according to Apollod. iii. 12, § 2, Venus bore a second son to Anchises. One of the questions discussed by Didymus the Grammarian was 'de Æneæ matre verâ,' (Sen. Ep. 88, § 32,) which question implies the idea that his birth from a goddess was fabulous, and that his real mother was a mortal. Dio Cassius represents Antony, in his speech over the body of Cæsar, as alluding to the doubt whether Æneas was the son of Venus, xliv. 37. The treatise of Lucian de Astrolog. c. 20, says that it would be impious to believe that Æneas was the son of Venus: the true meaning of the fable is, that the planet Venus exercised a benign influence on his birth. The Egyptians held that a woman might conceive from a god, but not a goddess from a man, Plut. Num. 4: a doctrine inconsistent with the received parentage of Æneas. On the generation of men by gods—a subject much discussed by the ancients—see Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. i. p. 471. The difference of sex among the gods is alluded to as a received article of faith in the Roman religion, by Augustus in Dio Cass. lvi. 2, and is ridiculed by Lactantius, Div. Inst. i. 16. Pliny treats the marriages of the gods as a childish fable: 'Matrimonia quidem inter deos credi, tantoque ævo ex his neminem nasci; et alios esse grandævos semperque canos, alios juvenes atque pueros, atri coloris, aligeros, claudos, ovo editos, et alternis diebus viventes morientesque, puerilium prope deliramentorum est.' H. N. ii. 5.

Nor do the supposed monuments of the presence of Æneas —such as temples, and tombs, and other memorials—at all strengthen the proof of the historical character of his adventures; or place his voyage on a more solid foundation than those of the other heroes. That a firm belief existed, at a comparatively early period, in the reality of his expedition to Latium, and that the affinity of the Romans and Trojans was recognised as an article of national faith, has been already shown: and when once such a belief existed, it was natural that commemorative rites and customs should spring up, apparently as witnesses of the fact, but in reality as products of the opinion. The monuments appealed to by Dionysius—such as the inscribed bowls at Dodona, the brazen cup in the temple of Juno in Iapygia, the statues of Lavinium, and the various religious ceremonies allusive to the arrival of Æneas(208)—cannot be received as proofs of the reality of his voyage, unless we are ready to attribute the same demonstrative force to other alleged relics of the period of the Trojan war; such as the tools with which Epeus made the wooden horse, preserved in the temple of Minerva at Lagaria, near Sybaris;(209) the arrows of Hercules, dedicated by Philoctetes in the temple of Apollo Alæus, near Croton;(210) the cup of Ulysses, exhibited at Circæum;(211) the tripod won by Diomed in the funeral games of Patroclus, preserved at

---

(208) i. 51. See particularly i. 49, where this class of evidence is appealed to as conclusive proof of the voyage of Æneas to Italy. τῆς δὲ ἐπὶ Ἰταλίαν Αἰνείου καὶ Τρώων ἀφίξεως, &c.

(209) Lycophron, v. 948—50; cum Schol. Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. 108, places them in a temple of Minerva Hellenia at Gargaria, near Metapontum. Justin. xx. 2, says that they were preserved in a temple of Minerva at Metapontum.

(210) Aristot. ib. 107. Compare Euphorion, Fragm. 40, ed. Meincke; Klausen, ubi sup. p. 164. Justin, xx. 1, places them in the temple of Apollo at Thurii.

(211) Above, p. 328, n. 124.

Delphi;(212) some wood of the plane-tree under which the Greek chieftains sat at Aulis;(213) the sacrificial knife used by Iphigenia in the temple of Diana at Tauris:(214) or to admit that the memorials of Hercules shown in various parts of Italy are proofs of his presence in that country.(215)

It is impossible to apply the historical style of interpretation to the voyage of Æneas, unless we apply it equally to other mythical narratives which stand in the same category. If we compare Æneas with Cortes, we must be prepared to compare Ulysses with Columbus, and consistently to reduce the whole heroic mythology of Greece to a historical standard, according to the comprehensive plan of the Abbé Banier. If however it is conceded that the Trojan heroes, and their adventures, lie beyond the domains of history, and that we are not entitled to look for truth in the Homeric poems, more than in the romances of chivalry, then it follows, by a necessary consequence, that the voyage of Æneas to Latium is a mere figment of the imagination, or that, to say the least, it cannot be proved to be a reality.

---

(212) This tripod had a commemorative inscription in four hexameter verses. Athen. vi. p. 232D. Compare Iliad, xxiii. 264, 513.

(213) The spring near which the plane-tree grew, and a brazen threshold near the place where Agamemnon's tent stood, were likewise shown. Paus. ix. 19, § 7. Compare Iliad ii. 307. The following are Mr. Grote's remarks upon the similar facts which have been appealed to as evidence of the reality of the Argonautic expedition. 'The widely-distant spots in which the monuments of the voyage were shown, no less than the incidents of the voyage itself, suggest no other parentage than epical fancy; the supernatural and the romantic not only constitute an inseparable portion of the narrative, but even embrace all the prominent and characteristic features. . . . . There was no tale amidst the wide range of the Grecian epic more calculated to be popular with the seaman, than the history of the primæval ship Argo and her distinguished crew, comprising heroes from all parts of Greece, and especially the Tyndarids Castor and Pollux, the heavenly protectors evoked during storm and peril. He localized the legend anew wherever he went, often with some fresh circumstances, suggested either by his own adventures or by the scene before him: he took a sort of religious possession of the spot, and connected it by a bond of faith with his native land, when he erected in it a temple or an altar with appropriate commemorative solemnities. The Jasonium thus established, and indeed every visible object called after the name of the hero, not only served to keep alive the legend of the Argo in the minds of future comers or inhabitants, but was accepted as an obvious and satisfactory proof that this marvellous vessel had actually touched there in her voyage.' Hist. of Gr. vol. i. p. 333.

(214) Dio Cass. xxxv. 11.

(215) λέγουσι δὲ πολλαχοῦ τῆς Ἰταλίας Ἡρακλέους εἶναι πολλὰ μνημόσυνα, ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἃς ἐκεῖνος ἐπορεύθη, Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. 97. Marks of his footsteps were shown near Pandosia in Iapygia, on which no one was permitted to tread, ib. Memorials of Jason (τεκμήρια, μνημεῖα, σημεῖα) were also shown in the Adriatic, and the island of Elba, ib. 105. It was believed that the Ister had two branches, and that he sailed up the branch which fell into the Pontus, and down the branch which fell into the Adriatic.

CHAPTER X.

THE ALBAN KINGDOM AND THE FOUNDATION OF ROME.

§ 1 AFTER the death of Æneas, his Lavinian sovereignty, and his dominion over the subjects of Latinus, passed, by right of hereditary succession, to his son. Concerning the name of this son, and his maternity, there are various accounts: some say that it was Ascanius, or Iulus, the son of Creusa; others give to her son the name of Euryleon, while another account describes the successor of Æneas as his son by Lavinia, the heiress of King Latinus.(1)

---

(1) See Dion. Hal. i. 65; Appian, Rom. Hist. i. 1. Both these writers describe Euryleon as assuming the name of Ascanius. The Script. de Orig. G. R. p. says: 'Ascanius, idem qui Euryleo.' c. 14. Dio Cassius, vol. i. p. 4, calls Ascanius, or Ilus, the son of Creusa. Livy considers the parentage of the son of Æneas, on the mother's side, as doubtful: 'Haud nihil ambigam (quis enim rem tam veterem pro certo affirmet) hiccine fuerit Ascanius, [*i.e.* the son of Lavinia] an major quam hic, Creusâ matre Ilio incolumi natus, comesque inde paternæ fugæ, quem Julum eundem Julia gens auctorem nominis sui nuncupat. Is Ascanius, ubicumque et quâcunque matre genitus (certe natum Æneâ constat) abundante Lavinii multitudine,' &c. i. 3. In i. 1, he says of the marriage of Æneas with Lavinia: 'Brevi stirps quoque virilis ex novo matrimonio fuit, cui Ascanium parentes dixere nomen.' The name Ascanius is Trojan; see Klausen, p. 119—38. According to Strabo, xiii. 1, § 27, the Julian gens derived its appellation from a certain Iulus, a descendant of Æneas, who was himself named after Iulus the son of Æneas. Concerning Iulus, see Klausen, p. 1071.

According to Serv. ad Æn. iv. 159, Ascanius likewise bore the name of Iulus, Ilus, Dardanus, and Leontodamas. The legend which made Ascanius reign in Troy over the remnant of the Trojans, has been mentioned above, p. 307. This was invented in order to reconcile the prediction in Homer with the Italian colony of Æneas. Virgil makes Ascanius, or Iulus, the son of Æneas and Creusa. Æn. ii. 652, 666, 674. His double name is explained thus:

> At puer Ascanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo
> Additur, Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno.—i. 267-8.

The Julian gens is derived from him:

> Nascetur pulchrâ Trojanus origine Cæsar,
> Imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
> Julius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.—i. 286-8.

Julius Cæsar stated that Ascanius began to be called Iulus, after the death of Mezentius. Serv. ad Æn. i. 267.

According to Livy, Lavinia, the mother, or step-mother, of Ascanius, administers the kingdom as regent for a time, on account of his youth. Everything is peaceable; the Etruscans have been reduced to tranquillity by the battle under Æneas; prosperity soon produces an increase of population; and Ascanius, leaving Lavinium to the queen-mother, founds a new town on a long ridge under the Alban mount, which he calls Alba Longa.(2) The account of Dionysius is different. He makes no mention of a minority and a regency; and he supposes Ascanius and the Latins to be hardly pressed by the Etruscans after the death of Æneas. Mezentius, their king, treats the Latins as a subject people, and commands them to pay tribute to the Etruscans of their entire annual produce of wine. Ascanius and the Latins are roused to indignation by this requisition. Ascanius vows the year's produce of wine to Jupiter, and storms the Etruscan camp by night. The attack is successful. Lausus, the king's son, is killed; and Mezentius is glad to make peace with the Latins, and to become their faithful ally.(3)

The story of the Etruscan requisition of wine is nothing more than an explanatory legend of a Roman festival, called the *Rustica Vinalia*. It is told at length by Ovid, though with some diversity of circumstances. According to him, Æneas and Turnus are contending for the hand of the daughter of Latinus. Turnus obtains the assistance of Mezentius and the Etruscans by a promise of the Latin vintage of the year. Æneas outbids

---

(2) Livy i. 3. The series of Alban kings is illustrated by Schwegler, vol. i. p. 335—347; and Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i. p. 136—7. In Martyn's Dissertation upon the Æneids of Virgil (London, 1770, 1 vol. 12mo), Diss. vi. is on the Alban kings, and in the Dissertatio of Theodorus Ryckius, de Primis Italiæ Colonis et Æneæ adventu (in his edition of Holstenii notæ in Steph. Byz. Lug. Bat. 1684, 1 vol. fol.), c. xi. relates to the same subject.

(3) Dion. Hal. i. 65. The origin of lightning on the left as a favourable omen was referred to this war. It was said that when Ascanius and the Trojans were besieged by Mezentius, Ascanius prayed to Jupiter for a favourable sign. Jupiter sent lightning to the left, in a clear sky, and the Trojans were victorious; so that the omen was ever after held to be a good one. Dion. Hal. ii. 5.

Turnus by offering it to Jupiter, whereupon the better vow prevails, and Mezentius is slain.(4)

Thirty years after the foundation of Lavinium, Ascanius, according to the omen of the sow and her thirty pigs, founds Alba Longa.(5) The name of the new city was supposed to allude to the colour of the sow and of her offspring.(6) When Alba was founded, the statues of the Penates, which Æneas had brought from Troy, were transported to the new city, and placed in a shrine inaccessible to the profane. Nevertheless, they were found the next day upon their former pedestals at Lavinium.

---

(4) See Fast. iv. 877—900. The following are the verses in which the rival vows are described:

> Annuerant Rutuli; Mezentius induit arma;
> Induit Æneas, alloquiturque Jovem:
> Hostica Tyrrheno vota est vindemia regi;
> Jupiter e Latio palmite musta feres.
> Vota valent meliora. Cadit Mezentius ingens,
> Atque indignanti pectore plangit humum.

The same account of the condition for the assistance of Mezentius is given by Varro ap. Plin. xiv. 14. Festus, p. 265, merely says: 'Rustica Vinalia—Jovis dies festus, quia Latini bellum gerentes adversus Mezentium, omnes vini libationem ei Deo dedicaverunt.' The Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 18, agrees with Ovid. Dio Cassius, vol. i. p. 5, says that Mezentius demands of Ascanius the entire produce of Latium as an annual tribute: which is another version of the same story.

(5) Dion. Hal. i. 66. Livy, i. 2, who suppresses the omen of the sow, says only, 'Inter Lavinium et Albam Longam coloniam deductam triginta *ferme* interfuere anni.'

> Ante oculos Laurens castrum, murusque Lavinî est,
> Albaque ab Ascanio condita Longa duce.
> Tibull. ii. 5, 49-50.

Varro de R. R. ii. 4, and de L. L. v. § 144; Dio Cassius, vol. i. p. 4, and the Scriptor de Orig. G. R. c. 17, refer the thirty pigs to the thirty years. See above, p. 334, n. 158. Strabo, v. 3, § 2, states that Ascanius founded Alba.

Steph. Byz. in v. says, Ἄλβα, πόλις Ἰταλίας, ἣν ἔκτισαν οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ Λαβινίου Λατῖνοι, Τρῶες ὄντες.

> At puer Ascanius . . . . . .
> Triginta magnos volvendis mensibus orbes
> Imperio explebit, regnumque ab sede Lavinî
> Transferet, et Longam multâ vi muniet Albam.
> Æn. i. 267—71; cf. v. 597; viii. 478.

One account of the motive for the foundation of Alba, is that Ascanius withdrew from Lavinium from fear of the dislike which his stepmother Lavinia entertained for him. Vitans enim novercalem invidiam deseruit Lavinium. Serv. ad Æn. i. 270.

(6) Varro, de L. L. v. 144, says: 'Propter colorem suis et loci naturam Alba Longa dicta.' The Scriptor de Orig. G. R. c. 17, is more explicit: 'Eam ex formâ, quod ita in longum porrecta est, Longam, ex colore suis, Albam cognominavit.' The same explanation is given by Diodorus, ap. Euseb. Chron. p. 215, ed. Mai; but according to the same writer, as cited

---

by Syncellus, Ascanius named the town from Alba, the original name of the Tiber. See vii. 3 and 4.

Virgil likewise alludes significantly to the colour of the sow and her young—

Littoreis ingens inventa sub ilicibus sus,
Triginta capitum fetus enixa jacebit,
Alba, solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati.
Hic locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum.
Æn. iii. 389—93 ; viii. 43-5.

Ecce autem, subitum atque oculis mirabile monstrum,
Candida per sylvam cum fetu concolor albo
Procubuit, viridique in litore conspicitur sus.—viii. 80-3.

Propertius makes the same allusion—

Et stetit Alba potens, albæ suis omine nata,
Hac ubi Fidenas longe erat ire viâ.—iv. 1, 35-6.

Dio Cassius, vol. i. p. 5, says that both Alba and the Alban mount derived their names from the sow.

Juvenal alludes to the same origin, but in an ironical manner:

Tum gratus Iulo,
Atque novercali sedes prælata Lavino,
Conspicitur sublimis apex, cui candida nomen
Scrofa dedit (lætis Phrygibus mirabile sumen)
Et nunquam visis triginta clara mamillis.—xii. 70—4.

Zonaras, vii. 1, says that the town was called Alba from its whiteness, and Longa from its length.

Conon, Narr. 46, speaks of the triteness of the legend which makes Æneas (not Ascanius) the founder of Alba, and recounts the prediction of eating the tables: ὁ δὲ τὸ Ῥωμαῖον γένος εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφέρων καὶ οἰκιστὴν ποιῶν Ἄλβας, καὶ τὸ χρηστήριον ὃ κατοικεῖν ἐπέτρεπεν ὅποι' ἂν αὐτὸς ἅμα τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ θύσας μετὰ τῶν σιτίων καταφάγοι καὶ τὰς τραπίζας, οὗτος κατημάξευται. Conon lived in the Augustan age.

Lycophron says that Æneas founds thirty castles, or cities, in the land of the Borigoni, beyond the Latins and Daunians, taking their number from the farrow of a *black* sow, whom he brings in a ship from Troy. v. 1252—8. Tzetzes, in his scholia on this passage, blames Lycophron for departing from the received account, which he sets out at length in his note on v. 1232.

The geographical position of Alba has been accurately determined by Mr. Bunbury, in his art. Alba, in Dr. Smith's Dict. of Anc. Geogr. Compare Bormann, ubi sup. p. 141. It was on the opposite side of the lake from the modern Albano, although the sow with her thirty young appears as an armorial ensign over the town-gate. Niebuhr is mistaken in placing the ancient citadel at the place entitled *Rocca di Papa*. Hist. vol. i. p. 200. Mr. Bunbury supposes, with probability, that the name of *Alba* was derived from its lofty or Alpine situation: See Schwegler, ib. p. 310.

The number *thirty* seems to be connected with the thirty Alban towns, or the thirty Latin colonies, see Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 202; vol. ii p. 17—24; and Dion. Hal. iii. 31.

The greatest number which a sow produces in one litter is about twenty.

Having been removed a second time, they again returned; whereupon the new colonists, seeing that the gods were displeased at the change of place, send six hundred curators of the holy rites, under the leadership of Ægestus, back to Lavinium.(7) Dionysius describes these sacred images at length, but with considerable reserve; for he condemns with severity the impiety of some writers who had made disclosures concerning them, of things which it was not permitted to see, or even to hear.(8)

§ 2 Ascanius, having reigned thirty-eight years, is succeeded by Silvius, with regard to whom there are two distinct accounts. One makes him the son of Ascanius;(9) the other represents him to be the posthumous son of Æneas, and therefore the half-brother of Ascanius. According to the latter story, Lavinia, being left pregnant at the death of Æneas, fears the jealousy of her step-son, and flies to the woods, where she is concealed by a shepherd named Tyrrhus. In this retreat she bears a son, who from the place of his birth and education is called *Silvius*.(10) At length Silvius and his mother are brought from the woods, and

---

(7) This is the account of Dionysius, i. 67. It is also given by the writer de Orig. G. R. c. 17, and Dio Cass. vol. i. p. 5. Serv. ad Æn. i. 270. Ad quam [Albam] cum de Lavinio dii Penates translati, nocte proximâ Lavinium redissent, atque eos denuo Albam Ascanius transtulisset, et illi iterum redissent Lavinium, eos manere passus est, datis qui sacris præessent, agroque eis assignato, quo se alerent. The reappearance of Ægestus (the eponymous founder of Egesta) on this occasion is singular. Augustine, Civ. Dei. x. 16, treats this as a real miracle performed by the heathen gods.

(8) See Dion. Hal. i. 67—9. The language of Dionysius respecting these holy images resembles that of Herodotus in speaking of mystical subjects.

(9) Livy, i. 4. Silvius deinde regnat, Ascanii filius, casu quodam in silvis natus. According to Festus, p. 23, Ascanius had two sons, Julius and Æmylus. From the latter the gens Æmilia was descended.

(10) Dion. i. 70: Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 16-17. Compare Servius Æn. i. 270. Quod timore Ascanii Lavinia post Æneæ mortem ad Tyrum [leg. Tyrrhum] paternum pastorem gravida confugit ad silvas, ibique Silvium peperit. Id. ad vi. 760. Cujus [scil. Ascanii] Lavinia timens insidias gravida confugit ad silvas, et latuit in casâ pastoris Tyrrhi. . . . Et illic enixa est Silvium. Sed cum Ascanius flagraret invidiâ, evocavit novercam, et ei concessit Laurolavinium, sibi vero Albam constituit. Qui quoniam sine liberis periit, Silvio, qui et ipse Ascanius dictus est, suum reliquit imperium. Tyrrhus, the herdsman of Latinus, is mentioned in Virg. Æn. vii. 485. Dio Cass., vol. i. p. 5, makes Silvius the son of Æneas and Lavinia, but he also mentions the story of his being the son of Ascanius.

Virgil, in the following verses, makes Silvius the immediate successor of reconciled with Ascanius — a proceeding which is variously related.(11)

Upon the death of Ascanius there arose a contention for the throne between his son Iulus, and Silvius, the posthumous son of Æneas. The question was referred to the assembly of the citizens, who decided in favour of Silvius, because he was the son of Lavinia, from whom the right to the kingdom was derived.(12) To Iulus certain religious functions were assigned,

---

Æneas and of Ascanius his son by a Trojan wife. His blood is mixed of Trojan and Italian:

> Ille, vides, purâ juvenis qui nititur hastâ
> Proxima sorte tenet lucis loca; primus ad auras
> Ætherias Italo commixtus sanguine surget
> Silvius, Albanum nomen, tua postuma proles:
> Quem tibi longævo serum Lavinia conjux
> Educet silvis regem, regumque parentem:
> Unde genus Longâ nostrum dominabitur Albâ.
> Æn. vi. 760—66.

The Trojan pedigree of the Alban kings is thus deduced by Ovid:

> Dardanon Electrâ nesciret Atlantide natum
> Scilicet, Electran concubuisse Jovi?
> Hujus Erichthonius: Tros est generatus ab illo;
> Assaracon creat hic, Assaracusque Capyn.
> Proximus Anchises, cum quo commune parentis
> Non dedignata est nomen habere Venus.
> Hinc satus Æneas: pietas spectata per ignes
> Sacra patremque humeris, altera sacra, tulit.
> Venimus ad felix aliquando nomen Iuli,
> Unde domus Teucros Julia tangit avos.
> Postumus huic, qui quod silvis fuit ortus in altis,
> Silvius in Latiâ gente vocatus erat.—Fast. iv. 31—42.

The parentage of Silvius is not clearly expressed in the last couplet; but the meaning appears to be, as in Virgil, that he is the posthumous son of Æneas.

Silvius is called the son of Æneas in Syncellus, vol. i. p. 333, ed. Bonn.

(11) Dionysius says that Ascanius labouring under the suspicion of having killed Lavinia, Tyrrhus produces her and her child. This agrees with one of the stories in the Orig. G. R. c. 16. The other is, that Ascanius offered a reward for her discovery. A different account is contained in an entry in the Canon of Eusebius, p. 311, ed. Mai: 'Ascanius Æneæ filius derelicto novercæ suæ Laviniæ regno, Albam urbem condidit, et Silvium Postumum fratrem suum, Æneæ ex Laviniâ filium, summa pietate educavit.'

(12) Dion. Hal. i. 70; Orig. G. R. c. 17. Ovid follows Virgil in identifying Ascanius and Iulus:

> Inde sub Ascanii ditione *binominis* Alba,
> Resque Latina fuit.—Met. xiv. 609-10.

According to an account preserved in the Canon of Eusebius, the preference of *Postumus* to *Iulus* was made by the testamentary disposition as a compensation for the loss of more substantial power: these descended by inheritance to the Julian family, and were exercised by that distinguished house in the time of Dionysius.(13) The political government, however, became hereditary in the family of Silvius; and hence all the Alban kings, his descendants, adopted the name of Silvius in addition to their own.(14) This statement has naturally given rise to the conjecture that there was a Silvian gens in Alba, who assigned to themselves these hereditary honours;(15) but there is no historical proof of its existence.

The succession of the Alban kings, from the commencement to the end of the line (with the inclusion of Æneas), as represented by Livy, Dionysius, and Diodorus, and in the chronicle of Eusebius, may with some slight variations be reduced to the following series. In the years of the reign, annexed to each king, Dionysius and Diodorus agree, and are followed by the Canon of Eusebius:—

KINGS.	YEARS OF REIGN.
1. Æneas(16)	5

---

of Ascanius, not by the vote of the citizens: 'Ascanius Iulium filium procreavit, a quo familia Juliorum orta. Et propter ætatem parvuli, quia necdum regendis civibus idoneus erat, Silvium Postumnum fratrem suum regni reliquit heredem;' p. 312. The account of Diodorus, ap. Euseb. p. 215, agrees with that of Dionysius.

(13) ἦν ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γένος ἐκαρποῦτο, Ἰούλιοι κληθέντες ἀπ' ἐκείνου: i. 70.

(14) Mansit Silviis postea omnibus cognomen, qui Albæ regnarunt. Livy, i. 3. Ejusdem posteri omnes cognomento Silvii, usque ad conditam Romam, Albæ regnaverunt, ut est scriptum Annalium Pontificalium lib. iv. Orig. G. R. 17. The same statement is made by Servius, ad Æn. vi. 763, 770; and Appian, Hist. Rom. i. 2.

(15) Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 207; Klausen, p. 777. The following account of the Silvian line of Alba is given in the Chronographia of Joannes Malala (who is considered by Gibbon to have lived soon after the time of Justinian). p. 168—70, ed. Bonn. Æneas marries Albania, the daughter of King Latinus, and founds a large city called Albania. He is succeeded by Ascanius Julius, his son by Creusa, who founded the city of Lavinia, transferring the seat of government from Albania. Albas, the son of Ascanius, is king of the Albans, and he founds the city of Silvis, which becomes the seat of government, and the remaining kings are called Silvii. A similar account is given by Cedrenus, vol. i. p. 238, ed. Bonn, who adds that Evander and Palas, the sons of Æneas, ruled over a province called Valens. Both writers state that they built a large and a splendid house, and that from the name of the latter the houses of kings acquired the name of palaces.

(16) According to Dion. Hal. i. 63-4. Troy was taken seventeen

KINGS.	YEARS OF REIGN.
2. Ascanius(17)	38
3. Silvius Postumus	29
4. Æneas Silvius(18)	31
5. Latinus Silvius	51
6. Alba	39
7. Epytus, or Atys(19)	26

---

days before the summer solstice. Æneas set sail in the autumn of the same year, and wintered in Thrace. The following winter was passed in Sicily, and in the ensuing spring he arrived in Latium. The joint reign of Latinus and Æneas lasted for a year: Latinus then died, and Æneas succeeded to his kingdom. Æneas died in the seventh year after the taking of Troy; ib. i. 16. Ascanius, in the thirtieth year from the establishment of Lavinium, founded Alba Longa. The Canon of Eusebius assigned three years to the reign of Æneas, beginning at the third, or, as others said, the eighth year after the capture of Troy; p. 311, ed. Mai (in the Script. Vet. Nov. Coll. vol. viii). According to Syncellus, vol. i. p. 323, some said that Æneas reigned three years from the ninth year after the capture of Troy; others that he reigned eight years from the fourth year after the same event. In either case he would have died twelve years after the taking of Troy. Virgil supposes the voyage of Æneas to occupy seven years. Æn. i. 755, v. 726. See Heyne, Exc. ii. ad Æn. iii.; Exc. iii. ad Æn. xii. He assigns three years to the reign of Æneas. Æn. i. 263—6. Diodorus ap. Euseb. Chron. p. 213, Mai and Syncellus, vol. i. p. 323, likewise assign three years to Æneas.

The passage of Dionysius respecting the date of the capture of Troy is illustrated by Clinton, Fast. Hel. vol i. p. 126-7, where the passages of the ancients fixing the *precise day* of this event are collected. Where nothing is known it is as easy to be precise as to be vague. Mr. Clinton, however, thinks it 'possible that *some tradition* had been preserved of the season of the year in which Troy was taken, and that the attempt of the early writers to assign the month and the day was founded upon this tradition.' On the supposed day of the capture of Troy, see Boeckh, Corp. Inscript. Gr. vol. ii. p. 328.

Different dates were given by the ancients for the foundation of Lavinium: Dionysius considers the second year after the taking of Troy as the most probable; i. 63. The same date is given by Cassius Hemina, ap. Solin. ii. 14.

(17) The different accounts of the reign of Ascanius nearly agree in the number 38. Virgil makes it last only thirty years:

Triginta magnos volvendis mensibus orbes
Imperio explebit. Æn. i. 269-70.

Virgil however is not consistent with himself, for in Æn. viii. 47—8, he reckons the thirty years from the arrival of Æneas to the foundation of Alba.

(18) Eusebius, Chron. p. 314. says, that according 'to another history, the fourth king is Latinus Silvius, the son of Lavinia and Melampus, uterine brother of Postumus, and Æneas Silvius is the fifth. Ovid has two lists of the Alban kings, Fast. iv. 31—56; Met. xiv. 609—22. 771-2: but both omit Æneas Silvius. He is however expressly mentioned by Virgil.

(19) The name of the seventh king is Epitus in Diodorus, Ovid, and the Canon of Eusebius; in Livy it is Atys. In the Greek text of

KINGS.	YEARS OF REIGN.
8. Capys	28
9. Calpetus(20)	13
10. Tiberinus	8
11. Agrippa	41
12. Aremulus, or Remulus(21)	19
13. Aventinus	37
14. Procas	23
15. Amulius	42
16. Numitor(22)	2

Dionysius the name is written *Capetus;* but this appears to be merely a variation of *Calpetus*, the ninth king; for in Dionysius, as quoted in the Armenian text of Eusebius, the name is written *Epistus* (p. 205; compare the list in p. 270). In Ovid, Fast. iv. 46, the MSS. vary between *Calpetus*, *Carpetus*, and *Capetus*, for the ninth king. The Canon of Eusebius, p. 318, gives *Attius* and *Ægyptius*, as variations of the name of the seventh king. *Attius* corresponds with the *Atys* of Livy; *Ægyptios* or *Ægyptius*, as in Syncellus, vol. i. p. 347, is apparently a corruption of Epitus or Æpytus. The descent of Atia, the mother of Augustus, was traced to Atys; and it may be doubted whether Calpetus in this series was not the more ancient name, for which Atys was afterwards substituted. See Virg. Æn. v. 568.

(20) *Carpentus*, who is ninth king in the Canon of Eusebius, and *Carmentus*, who is twelfth king in Syncellus, appear to be corruptions of *Calpetus*, or *Carpetus*. The name *Capetus* occurs in the Greek mythology, in the list of the suitors of Hippodamia killed by Œnomaus. Paus. vi. 21, § 10.

(21) The name of the twelfth king is written *Aremulus* in the Canon of Eusebius, Syncellus, and the Origin. Gent. Rom. In Diodorus and Dionysius, as cited in the Armenian text of Eusebius, p. 205—216, it is written *Amulius*, a manifest error for *Aremulus*. Dio Cassius and Zonaras likewise have *Amulius* for *Aremulus*.

In the Greek text of Dionysius, the name is written 'Αλλώδιος, 'Αλλάδιος, and 'Αλλάζης, in the manuscripts, i. 71, which are other corruptions of 'Αρέμυλος. In Livy, the name is *Romulus*, in Ovid *Remulus;* these however, are only variations of form, as the Greek authors write Remus 'Ρῶμος. Appian writes the name 'Ρωμύλος, like Livy. In the list in Ovid's Metamorphoses, Agrippa is omitted, while Remulus and Acrota are the sons of Tiberinus, Acrota succeeding his elder brother. In the Fasti, Agrippa is the son of Tiberinus, and Remulus the son of Agrippa. The list of the mythographer in Bode, Script. Myth. Lat. vol. i. p. 63, agrees in this respect with Ovid's Metamorphoses.

(22) Dionysius, i. 9, and 45, says that Romulus lived seventeen generations (γενεαί) after the Trojan war. Again, in i. 45, he says that Romulus was seventeenth from Æneas, which expression conveys the same meaning as the former one. This result seems to be obtained by reckoning both Numitor and Amulius, and not by including Rhea Silvia, the mother of Romulus, in the line.

Servius, ad Æn. vi. 767. '*Proximus ille Procas:*' Standi ordine, non nascendi. Nam duodecimus fuit. '*Et Capys:*' Sextus est rex Albanorum, There are other lists of the Alban kings which differ materially from that received by the principal writers. Thus the series in the work *de Origine Gentis Romanæ* is much shorter; it interposes only six, instead of twelve, kings between Ascanius and Numitor.(23) Dio Cassius fills the same interval with only seven descents.(24) The list of Appian(25) agrees with the received one, with this exception, that it entirely omits Alba and Atys, the sixth and seventh kings, and therefore makes only ten kings between Ascanius and Numitor. A Latin mythographer of the fifth century interposes only nine names between Æneas and Amulius, omitting Ascanius, Æneas Silvius, Alba, Tiberinus, Agrippa, and Procas, but inserting Acrota and a new king Palatinus.(26) Virgil mentions Silvius Postumus, Silvius Æneas, Capys, Procas, and Numitor, as Alban kings, but without enumerating the whole line.(27) In Georgius Syncellus a list is given (likewise repeated in the Chronicle of Eusebius) which differs from the generally received list in the succession of the kings, the names of several, and in the years of their reigns. This list is as follows:—

KINGS.	YEARS OF REIGN.
1. Æneas	3
2. Ascanius	37

Item Numitor tertius decimus fuit. These numbers are consistent with the list in the text, if we count exclusively of Ascanius. It is, however, not improbable that the list of Servius omitted one of the names, and that Ascanius is included.

(23) See c. 15—19. The series is thus given: 1. Ascanius; 2. Silvius; 3. Latinus; 4. Tiberius; 5. Aremulus; 6. Aventinus; 7. Procas; 8. Numitor and Amulius.

(24) Vol. i. p. 5. These are: 1. Ascanius; 2. Silvius; 3. Æneas; 4. Latinus; 5. Capys; 6. Tiberinus; 7. Amulius; 8. Aventinus; 9. Numitor and Amulius. The list in Zonaras, vii. 1, who generally followed Dio, agrees with this. The fifth name which in Zonaras is written *Pastis*, is an error either of the author or the transcribers. Zonaras however makes Numitor and Amulius the *grandsons* of Aventinus, which supposes the interposition of Procas.

(25) Hist. Rom. i. 2.

(26) See Bode. Script. Myth. Lat. vol. i. p. 63. His series is: 1. Æneas; 2. Silvius; 3. Latinus; 4. Epytus; 5. Capus; 6. Capetus; 7. Remulus; 8. Acrota; 9. Aventinus; 10. Palatinus; 11. Amulius and Numitor. This account supposes Ascanius to have been killed before Æneas comes to Italy, and therefore excludes Ascanius from the Alban line.

(27) Æn. vi. 760—70.

KINGS.	YEARS OF REIGN.
3. Silvius Æneæ	29
4. Silvius Julius	31
5. Æneas Silvius	50
6. Silvius	30
7. Anchises Silvii	10
8. Ægyptius	20
9. Cappys	31
10. Tiberius	51
11. Aremulus	19
12. Carmentus	16
13. Silvius	18
14. Procas	32
15. Amulius	23
16. Numitor, with him, or after him,(28)	2

The facts recorded concerning these kings are not very numerous. Æneas Silvius is related to have been excluded from his kingdom by an usurping guardian, from whom he only recovered it after an interval of fifty-three years.(29) This account, however, cannot be reconciled with the statement of Dionysius and others, that his reign lasted thirty-one years.(30)

The next king, Latinus Silvius, is said to have founded some colonies, which were called the towns of the Prisci Latini.(31)

---

(28) See Syncell. vol. i. p. 323, 347, 360. The same list occurs in Eusebius, Chron. p. 270-1.

(29) . Qui te nomine reddet
Silvius Æneas, pariter pietate vel armis
Egregius, si unquam regnandam acceperit Albam.
Æn. vi. 768—70.

Servius: 'Recepit autem a tutore, qui ejus invasit imperium, quod ei vix anno quinquagesimo tertio restituit. Et rem plenam historiæ per transitum tetigit.' The last words imply that full details had been given by some writer concerning the reign of Æneas Silvius. The expression of Virgil is quite inconsistent with a long reign, which Dionysius and others attribute to this king.—It has been already pointed out that Ovid entirely suppresses Æneas Silvius.

(30) Above, p. 359.

(31) Ab eo coloniæ aliquot deductæ, Prisci Latini appellati. Livy, i. 3. Having described the foundation of Alba by the Latins, Dionysius adds: ἐξ ἧς ὁρμώμενοι πολλὰς μὲν καὶ ἄλλας πόλεις ἔκτισαν, τῶν κληθέντων Πρίσκων Λατίνων, ἐξ ὧν αἱ πλεῖσται ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἦσαν οἰκούμεναι.—i. 45. The mythical

The names of many of these are enumerated by Dionysius and Virgil, and in the work de Origine Gentis Romanæ.(32) With respect to the origins of some of them, other accounts are extant; thus, according to Solinus, Gabii was founded by Galatus and Bius, brothers, of Siculian race; and Aricia by Archilochus, likewise a Siculian.(33) Crustumerium is derived from another Siculian;(34) while Præneste is said to have been founded by Cæculus, the son of Vulcan;(35) and Tusculum by Telegonus, the son of Ulysses and Circe.(36)

---

origins of the gentile name *Latinus* have been already given: the compound appellative *Prisci Latini* is doubtless a tradition of a real usage; it indicated the contract between some ancient union of Latin towns, and others which were subsequently added. The conjecture of Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 79, 377, that *Priscus* was a gentile name, and that *Prisci Latini* is equivalent to *Prisci et Latini*, is deservedly rejected by Bormann, ib. p. 33.

(32) The following are the towns enumerated by Virgil, Æn. vi. 773—7: 1. Bola; 2. Cora; 3. Castrum Inui; 4. Collatia; 5. Fidenæ; 6. Gabii; 7. Nomentum. The Orig. G. R. c. 17, gives the following list: 1. Bovillæ; 2. Cameria; 3. Cora; 4. Crustumerium; 5. Gabii; 6. Locri [Corioli?]; 7 Præneste; 8. Tibur; 9. Tusculum; together with some others not named.

Diodorus, vii. 4, as preserved in the Armenian edition of Eusebius, p. 215, states as follows: 'Exin potestatem adeptus est Latinus, cognomento idem Silvius, annis L. Hic rebus gestis domi bellique inclaruit. Idem adjacentia oppida sustulit; tum veteres illas urbes, quæ Latinorum olim dicebantur, exstruxit octodecim.' These eighteen cities of the Prisci Latini are then enumerated, namely, 1. Aricia; 2. Boilus, also called Bola; 3. Cænina; 4. Cameria; 5. Cora; 6. Crustumerium: 7. Fregellæ; 8. Gabii; 9. Labicum; 10. Lanuvium; 11. Medullia; 12. Pometia; 13. Præneste; 14. Satricum; 15. Scaptia; 16. Tellenæ; 17. Tibur; 18. Tusculum. The colonization of Crustumerium by the Albans, long before the foundation of Rome, is also declared by Dion. Hal. ii. 36. Dionysius, ib. c. 35, says that Cænina was inhabited by the Siculians, from whom it was taken by the Aborigines. Tellenæ likewise was an ancient Siculian town, according to Dion. Hal. i. 16. Compare Wachsmuth, ubi sup. p. 107. Dion. Hal. ii. 58, says that Cameria was an Alban colony; and ib. 53, that Fidenæ was colonized from Alba with Nomentum and Crustumerium by three brothers, of whom the eldest founded Fidenæ. There were two other accounts of the foundation of Tibur: one that it was founded by Catillus, an Arcadian; another that it was an Argive colony.

(33) The foundation of Aricia by Archilochus the Siculian is reported on the authority of Cassius Hemina—concerning whom see Krause, p. 155. The bones of Orestes were brought to Aricia. Serv. Æn. ii. 116.

(34) Cassius Hemina tradidit Siculum quendam nomine uxoris suæ Clytæmnestræ condidisse Clytæmnestrum, mox corrupto nomine Crustumerium dictum. Alii volunt a crustulâ panis quam Trojani coacti fame exedisse dicuntur appellatam; ad Æn. vii. 631.

(35) See Bormann, ib. p. 215, and above. There was another story which attributed its foundation to Cæcas, a companion of Æneas. Festus in Cæculus, p. 44.

(36) Bormann, ib. p. 171. Above, 329.

Of Alba, Atys, Capys, and Capetus, no details are mentioned. Tiberinus, the next king, is said to have been drowned in the river Albula, and to have given it its subsequent name of Tiber.(37)

---

(37) Dion. Hal. i. 71, says that Tiberinus was killed in a battle near the Albula, and that his body was carried away by the river, whence it received his name. The same account is in Livy, i. 3; Orig. G. R. c. 18; Zonaras, vii. 1; and Diod. ap. Euseb. p. 216. Also in Ovid, Fast. iv. 47-8:

Cumque patris regnum post hunc Tiberinus haberet,
Dicitur in Tuscæ gurgite mersus aquæ.

And Met. xiv. 61—46:

Regnum Tiberinus ab illis
Cepit, et in Tusci demersus fluminis undis
Nomina fecit aquæ.

Compare Fast. ii. 387. Virgil describes the river Tiber as having been originally called Albula, and as having been afterwards named from Thybris, a king earlier than Evander and Æneas:

Tum reges, asperque immani corpore Thybris;
A quo post Itali fluvium cognomine Thybrim
Diximus: amisit verum vetus Albula nomen.
Æn. viii. 330—2.

According to Servius, in his notes on this passage, and on iii. 500, Thybris was a king of the Etruscans, who was killed near the river. Others said that this king plundered and maltreated persons near the river, and that its name was thus derived from ὕβρις. Others traced it to Tiberinus, a son of Janus and Camasena, who fell in battle near the river; where the name Camasena seems to be connected with the river Amasenus; Virg. Æn. vii. 685; xi. 547. Varro de L. L. v. § 29, also mentions Albula as the primitive name of the Tiber. He adds two origins of the name; one from Thebris, a king of the Veientes; another from Tiberinus, king of the Latins, who was drowned in it. The latter is a mere shadow of the Alban king. Servius mentions, as an objection to the derivation from Tiberinus, king of Alba, that the river was called Tiberis before Alba was founded. He adds however that Livy, in adopting this origin for the name, followed Alexander Polyhistor, who reported that Tiberinus, the son of Capetus, fell into the river while he was hunting, and gave it his name; compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 230. Servius likewise says that Tiberinus used to be invoked, in some religious rite, by the pontifices: 'Nam et a pontificibus indigitari solet;' compare Cic. de N. D. iii. 20. Another singular combination, is that the Tiber was named after a trench near Syracuse, made by the Athenian captives, and so called from the word ὕβρις. The Carthaginians are added in one version of this tale. Nevertheless, the name is said to have been brought to Latium by the Siculi, at the supposed migration which is placed many centuries before the contests of the Syracusans with the Carthaginians and Athenians. The idea of a river Thybris near Syracuse seems to have been borrowed from Theocritus, who, in Idyll. i. 117-8, says:

χαῖρ' Ἀρέθοισα,
και ποταμοί, τοί χεῖτε καλὸν κατα Θύμβριδος ὕδωρ.

Eustathius ad Dionys. Perieg. 350, assumes that a river is here meant; but Casaubon and Valckenaer understand the poet to refer to a mountain.

That the Tiber was originally called Albula is stated by Pliny, H. N. iii. 9. Syncellus, vol. i. p. 347, says that the Tiber, previously called Alba, was named after Tiberius, the Alban king. Diod. vii. 3, says that the original name of the Tiber was Alba.

The proper Latin name of the Tiber is Tiberis: the Greek writers

He is, in fact, the eponymous hero of that celebrated river. His successor, Agrippa, has nothing to distinguish him from the other phantom kings of the Alban line; but the next prince, Romulus, Remulus, or Aremulus, is said to have boasted that he could, with the weapons of his army, make a louder noise than the thunder; for which impious act—resembling that of Salmoneus, the mythical king of Elis—he was struck by lightning and hurled into the Alban lake. Another account represented him as having been washed away, or thrown by an earthquake, with his whole house, into the Alban lake; at the bottom of which the remains of his palace could be discerned in the time of Dionysius.(38) A similar belief with respect to subaqueous buildings has existed in other lakes both in ancient and modern times.(39)

---

however sometimes call it Θύμβρις (see Steph. Byz. in v.), and the Roman poets Thybris. This is intended as an allusion to Thymbra in the Troad, where there was a river called Thymbrius (Strab. xiii. 1, § 35). Thymbris and Thymbræus are used as names for Trojans in Æn. x. 124; xii. 458; compare Klausen, ubi sup. p. 553.

(38) Dion. Hal. i. 71; Diod. vii. 4, and ap. Euseb. p. 216; Orig. G. R. c. 18; Zonar. vii. 1.

> Remulus maturior annis
> Fulmineo periit, imitator fulminis, ictu.—Ovid, Met. xiv. 617-8;

and compare Fast. iv. 50. Appian, Hist. Rom. i. 6, says that this Romulus was struck by lightning. G. Syncellus, vol. i. p. 348, records that Aremulus ἐκεραυνώθη διὰ πολλὴν ἀσέβειαν. Livy makes no mention of any marvellous circumstance in connexion with Romulus Silvius.

Orosius, having described the cruelty of Phalaris, proceeds thus: 'Fuerat etiam paulo superiore tempore apud Latinos rex Aremulus, qui per annos octodecim flagitiis impietatibusque crescens, ad postremum divino judicio fulmine interceptus, matura supplicia immaturâ ætate dissolvit;' i. 20. According to the dates in the preceding table (p. 360), Aremulus would have begun to reign in 876 B.C., whereas the earliest date assigned to Phalaris is 656 B.C., and he probably lived about 570 B.C.

In the Canon of Eusebius, p. 323, there is the following entry respecting this king: 'Aremulus Silvius, Agrippæ superioris regis filius, præsidium Albanorum inter montes, ubi nunc Roma est, posuit: qui ob impietatem postea fulmine interiit. Hujus filius fuit Julius, proavus Julii Proculi, qui cum Romulo Romam commigrans fundavit gentem Juliam.' The received origin of the Julian house derives it from Iulus.

(39) See Bormann, ubi sup. p. 144. Stories of subaqueous buildings and towns are to be found in other places, similar to that of the palace of king Aremulus. Thus the ancient town of Herbadilla in Brittany is said to have been submerged on account of its wickedness, and to be now covered by the Lake of Grand-Lieu, under the waters of which the spires of the churches could be seen, and their bells heard; see Marchangy, Tristan le Voyageur, tom. i. p. 115. 357. This lake is the largest in France. The lake of Seeburg, near Göttingen, is on the site of a castle, which belonged to a wicked count named Isang. His castle was overwhelmed by the waters, on account of his impiety; but he escaped, and passed the rest of his life in a neighbouring monastery, to which he made

Aventinus, the successor of Romulus Silvius, is nothing more than the eponymous hero of the Aventine hill, the supposed place of his interment.(40)

Procas, the next king, is only distinguished by being the father of Numitor and Amulius, whose names bring us into immediate contact with the foundation legend of Rome. Numitor is the elder brother, who is wrongfully dispossessed of his throne by Amulius. He is the father of two children ; a son named Ægestus, or Lausus, whom Amulius puts to death while hunting ; and Ilia, the priestess of Vesta.(41) The sons

---

large donations. Grimm's Deutsche Sagen, no. 131. Arendsee, in the Altmark, is a lake which swallowed up an ancient castle; its walls may still be seen under the water. Grimm. ib. no. 111. At Bernsdorf, in Prussia, a church organ, which was sunk in crossing a neighbouring lake, is heard to play so long as there is singing in the church. Nodnagel, Deutsche Sagen und Legenden: Darmstadt, 1839, p. 31, 362. The following account of Lough Neagh is given by Giraldus Cambrensis, Topogr. Hibern. ii. c. 9, in Camden's Anglica, &c. p. 720 (Frankfort, 1602): 'Hujus autem eventus argumentum est non improbabile, quod piscatores aquæ illius turres ecclesiasticas (quæ more patrio arctæ sunt et altæ, necnon et rotundæ) sub undis manifeste sereno tempore conspiciunt; et extraneis transeuntibus, reique causas admirantibus, frequenter ostendunt.' Archippe, an ancient town founded by Marsyas, a Lydian, was said to have been swallowed by an earthquake, and covered by the Fucine lake ; Plin. N. H. iii. 17 ; Solin. c. 2, § 6. It is not stated that the remains of this town were visible in antiquity ; but a lost city has been seen under its waters in modern times : see Smith's Dict. of Anc. Geogr. art. Fucinus Lacus. The town of Saccumum was believed to be concealed under the Ciminian lake in Etruria. Ammian. Marcellin. xvii. 7, § 13 ; Sotion. de Mirab. Font. 41, (in Westermann's Paradoxographi, p. 190). The latter writer mentions another lake in Italy, called Sacatus, in which, when the water was clear, foundations of houses, temples, and statues were visible at the bottom. See Notes and Queries, vol. vii. p. 413.

(40) Dion. Hal. ; Livy ; Orig. G. R. ; Ovid, ib. Virgil makes Aventinus a son of Hercules, and of the priestess Rhea, begotten when Hercules drove the oxen of Geryon through Italy ; Æn. vii. 655—63. Servius, in his note on v. 657, says that the correct etymology of Aventinus is from *Aves*, because birds came up from the Tiber, and lodged there. Some, however, derived it from Aventinus, a king of the Aborigines, who was killed and buried on that spot; and some from the Alban king; while Varro said that the Sabines, when incorporated by Romulus, named it from Avens, a river of their country. Servius decides that the hill must have been named from *Aves*, or from the king of the Aborigines ; and that the son of Hercules received his name from the hill, instead of giving it.

(41) 'Quem [Procam] sequitur duri Numitor germanus Amuli ;
Ilia cum Lauso de Numitore sati.
Ense cadit patruo Lausus. Placet Ilia Marti,
Teque parit, gemino juncte Quirine Remo.'
Ovid. Fast. iv. 53-6 ; and see vi. 143.

Dion. Hal. i. 76, calls him Ægestus ; Dio Cass. vol. i. p. 5, Ægestes ; Appian, Hist. Rom. i. 2, Egestus. Livy does not name the son of Ilia, Romulus and Remus, slay their uncle Amulius, and restore their grandfather to his regal power.

§ 3 The year of the capture of Troy, according to the era of Eratosthenes, is 1184 B.C. That of the foundation of Rome, according to the era of Varro, is 753 B.C. The precise interval between these epochs is 431 years. Now the years assigned to the Alban kings, in the authorized list above cited, just make up this number, being 433 years. Dionysius says that Rome was founded in the 432nd year after the capture of Troy.(42) Diodorus said that the interval was 433 years.(43) Strabo gives 400 years as the interval between the foundation of Alba and that of Rome, which agrees with the received computation.(44) In the list of Syncellus, extending from Æneas to Romulus, the dates yield a total sum of only 402 years.(45) Virgil assigns three years to Æneas, thirty to Ascanius, and an aggregate of 300 for the reigns of the remaining Alban kings.(46) Justin agrees with Virgil; inasmuch as he affirms that the kingdom of Alba lasted 300 years.(47) Livy likewise

---

of Numitor. He merely says that Amulius 'stirpem fratris virilem interimit;' i. 3. Strabo, v. 3, § 2, does the same. The author of the Parallels of Plutarch, c. 36, uses the name Αἴνιτος, which seems to be a corruption of Αἴγιστος. The part of Amulius in the Alban history is assigned to a king named Tarchetius, by Promathion ap. Plut. Rom. 2.

(42) i. 71; ii. 2.

(43) αὕτη ἡ κτίσις ὑστερεῖ τῶν Τρωικῶν ἔτεσι τρισὶ πλείω τῶν ὑ καὶ λ'. Excerpt. lib. vii. ap. Syncell. vol. i. p. 366, ed. Bonn. Compare Euseb. p. 213, where the translation of the Armenian interpreter is given. Dionysius and Diodorus both follow the era of Eratosthenes: Fischer, Griechische Zeittafeln, p. 5—7.

(44) v. 3, § 2. (45) Above, p. 361.

(46) Æn. i. 257—77. Servius, ad v. 267, mentions a similar computation, viz., that 360 years intervened between the capture of Troy and the foundation of Rome. Assuming the Varronian era of Rome, this would give 1113 B.C. for the capture of Troy. A similar love of numerical symmetry has led Theocritus to attribute exactly 33,333 towns to Ptolemy Philadelphus, in the following singular verses:

οὐδέ τις ἄστεα τόσσα βροτῶν ἔχει ἔργα δαέντων·
τρεῖς μέν οἱ πολίων ἑκατοντάδες ἐνδέδμηνται,
τρεῖς δ' ἄρα χιλιάδες τρισσαῖς ἐπὶ μυριάδεσσι,
δοιαὶ δὲ τριάδες, μετὰ δέ σφισιν ἐννεάδες τρεῖς·
τῶν πάντων Πτολεμαῖος ἀγάνωρ ἐμβασιλεύει.

Idyll. x —5.

The sum is thus made up: 300+3000+30,000+6+2 3 .

(47) xliii. 1. Bellum deinde [Æneas] adver rem Etruscorum, gessit; in quo quum ipse occidisset,

of Ilia, Romulus and Remus, slay their uncle Amulius, and restore their grandfather to his regal power.

§ 3 The year of the capture of Troy, according to the era of Eratosthenes, is 1184 B.C. That of the foundation of Rome, according to the era of Varro, is 753 B.C. The precise interval between these epochs is 431 years. Now the years assigned to the Alban kings, in the authorized list above cited, just make up this number, being 433 years. Dionysius says that Rome was founded in the 432nd year after the capture of Troy.(42) Diodorus said that the interval was 433 years.(43) Strabo gives 400 years as the interval between the foundation of Alba and that of Rome, which agrees with the received computation.(44) In the list of Syncellus, extending from Æneas to Romulus, the dates yield a total sum of only 402 years.(45) Virgil assigns three years to Æneas, thirty to Ascanius, and an aggregate of 300 for the reigns of the remaining Alban kings.(46) Justin agrees with Virgil; inasmuch as he affirms that the kingdom of Alba lasted 300 years.(47) Livy likewise

---

of Numitor. He merely says that Amulius 'stirpem fratris virilem interimit;' i. 3. Strabo, v. 3, § 2, does the same. The author of the Parallels of Plutarch, c. 36, uses the name Αἴνιτος, which seems to be a corruption of Αἴγεστος. The part of Amulius in the Alban history is assigned to a king named Tarchetius, by Promathion ap. Plut. Rom. 2.

(42) i. 71; ii. 2.

(43) αὕτη ἡ κτίσις ὑστερεῖ τῶν Τρωικῶν ἔτεσι τρισὶ πλείω τῶν υ' καὶ λ'. Excerpt. lib. vii. ap. Syncell. vol. i. p. 366, ed. Bonn. Compare Euseb. p. 213, where the translation of the Armenian interpreter is given. Dionysius and Diodorus both follow the era of Eratosthenes: Fischer, Griechische Zeittafeln, p. 5—7.

(44) v. 3, § 2.

(45) Above, p. 361.

(46) Æn. i. 257—77. Servius, ad v. 267, mentions a similar computation, viz., that 360 years intervened between the capture of Troy and the foundation of Rome. Assuming the Varronian era of Rome, this would give 1113 B.C. for the capture of Troy. A similar love of numerical symmetry has led Theocritus to attribute exactly 33,333 towns to Ptolemy Philadelphus, in the following singular verses:

> οὐδέ τις ἄστεα τόσσα βροτῶν ἔχει ἔργα δαέντων·
> τρεῖς μέν οἱ πολίων ἑκατοντάδες ἐνδέδμηνται,
> τρεῖς δ' ἄρα χιλιάδες τρισσαῖς ἐπὶ μυριάδεσσι,
> δοιαὶ δὲ τριάδες, μετὰ δέ σφισιν ἐννεάδες τρεῖς·
> τῶν πάντων Πτολεμαῖος ἀγάνωρ ἐμβασιλεύει.
>
> Idyll. xvii. 81—5.

The sum is thus made up: 300+3000+30,000+6+27=33,333.

(47) xliii. 1. Bellum deinde [Æneas] adversus Mezentium, regem Etruscorum, gessit; in quo quum ipse cecidisset, in locum ejus Ascanius

appears to adopt a similar chronology, for he says that Alba, when it was destroyed in the reign of Tullus Hostilius, had stood 400 years.(48) Now the reign of Tullus Hostilius is placed between 673 and 642 B.C.; so that if we suppose Alba to have been destroyed about a century after the foundation of Rome, this date would imply that the Alban kingdom lasted 300 years. Upon the assumption that Rome was founded in 753 B.C., we should, by adopting the chronology of Virgil [333 + 7 years], arrive at 1093 B.C., as the date for the capture of Troy, which is ninety-one years later than that of Eratosthenes.(49) In the strange account of the Alban kingdom, given by Joannes Malalas,(50) the chronology, though different in details, is represented so as to make the duration of the time nearly the same as in the authorized computations. It is as follows:—

	YEARS OF REIGN.
Æneas	19
Ascanius Julius	25
Albas	36
The remaining Æneadæ	331
Total	411

---

filius successit; qui Lavinio relicto Longam Albam condidit, quæ trecentis annis caput regni fuit.

(48) Una hora quadringentorum annorum opus, quibus Alba steterat, excidio ac ruinis dedit. Livy, i. 29. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. note 577. Dionysius reckons the duration of the city of Alba at exactly 487 years, iii. 31; cf. 10, 23. Assuming that he placed its foundation in 1152 B.C., its demolition would fall in 665 B.C.

(49) In his 3rd Excursus to the 12th book of the Æneid, Heyne makes the following judicious remarks upon the attempts to reduce the legendary events of the Trojan settlement in Italy to a chronological scheme. 'Omnino notationes illas scriptorum, qui multis post sæculis antiquas res constituere et annis finire voluerunt, operâ factas esse statuendum est: nam *πατρόδοτα* illa, et per aliquot sæculorum decursum patrum narratione ad posteritatem transmissa, et propter hoc ipsum in tam multis variata, vix annis suis tam accurate illigari jam tum potuere, cum primum a priscis hominibus narrata sunt. Neque adeo mirari debemus, si hos ipsos annos fluctuante adhuc fide et auctoritate constitutos viderimus. Juvat tamen rationes ac modos persequi, quibus hæc digessit subtiliorum scriptorum diligentia.' Nevertheless, Heyne afterwards accuses Virgil of violating the truth of history in his chronology of the Alban kings. 'In duratione vero regni Albanorum et intervallo usque ad Romam conditam Virgilius *a verâ historiæ ratione* et omnium scriptorum fide recedit, si unum, quem quidem novi, Justinum excipias.'

(50) See above, p. 358, note 15.

have already seen, the duration of the Alban kingdom varies in different writers from 433 to 333 years, and the number of kings from fifteen to eight. Numerous minor variations, in the names of particular kings, and in the duration of their reigns, have been already indicated, and need not be dwelt upon again. All historical evidence is subject to discrepancies in points of detail; but such extensive diversities as those just described, unaccompanied by any rational ground of preference for any one version, are a decisive mark of traditionary fiction.(53)

A recent history of Rome indeed considers the royal line of Alba as resting on a sure historical basis; and as guaranteed by conclusive proofs. These are alleged to be:—1. A statement cited from the Pontifical Annals, that all the descendants of Postumus Silvius, down to the building of Rome, were called Silvii. 2. The prevalence of a belief in its historical nature among the ancients, especially such competent judges as Cassius Hemina. 3. The connexion of the names of individual kings with certain important or striking events of their reign, such as the foundation of the eighteen earliest colonies, the contests against Etruria, and the impious blasphemies of Aremulus, whose palace was swallowed by the lake.(54) We have here a

---

Ovid marks that Epitus, Capys, Calpetus, Tiberinus, Agrippa, and Romulus, succeeded one another in the direct line:

'Ille [Alba] dedit Capyi recidiva vocabula Trojæ,
  Et tuus est idem, Calpete, factus avus.
Cumque patris regnum post hunc Tiberinus haberet,
  Dicitur in Tuscæ gurgite mersus aquæ.
Jam tamen Agrippam natum Remulumque nepotem
  Viderat.' Fast. iv. 45—50.

Diodorus describes Procas as the son of Aventinus; Numitor and Amulius are the sons of Procas according to Livy and Eusebius. Appian, Hist. Rom. i. 2, likewise connects the whole series of Alban kings together as father and son. His account resembles some of the mythical genealogies in the Greek logographers and in Apollodorus. With respect to lineal descent in Greek successions of mythical kings, see the remarks of Mr. Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i. Introd. p. xv.

(53) Upon this rule of historical evidence, see the remarks of the author, in his 'Treatise on the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics,' vol. i. p. 283—9. The irreconcilable discrepancies in the schemes of early Assyrian and Median history, as delivered by the Greek writers, which are pointed out by Col. Mure, Hist. of Gr. Lit. vol. iv. p. 332—6. likewise serve to illustrate the same principle.

(54) Gerlach and Bachofen, vol. i. part i. p. 216.

have already seen, the duration of the Alban kingdom varies in different writers from 433 to 333 years, and the number of kings from fifteen to eight. Numerous minor variations, in the names of particular kings, and in the duration of their reigns, have been already indicated, and need not be dwelt upon again. All historical evidence is subject to discrepancies in points of detail; but such extensive diversities as those just described, unaccompanied by any rational ground of preference for any one version, are a decisive mark of traditionary fiction.(53)

A recent history of Rome indeed considers the royal line of Alba as resting on a sure historical basis; and as guaranteed by conclusive proofs. These are alleged to be:—1. A statement cited from the Pontifical Annals, that all the descendants of Postumus Silvius, down to the building of Rome, were called Silvii. 2. The prevalence of a belief in its historical nature among the ancients, especially such competent judges as Cassius Hemina. 3. The connexion of the names of individual kings with certain important or striking events of their reign, such as the foundation of the eighteen earliest colonies, the contests against Etruria, and the impious blasphemies of Aremulus, whose palace was swallowed by the lake.(54) We have here a

---

Ovid marks that Epitus, Capys, Calpetus, Tiberinus, Agrippa, and Romulus, succeeded one another in the direct line:

> 'Ille [Alba] dedit Capyi recidiva vocabula Trojæ,
> Et tuus est idem, Calpete, factus avus.
> Cumque patris regnum post hunc Tiberinus haberet,
> Dicitur in Tuscæ gurgite mersus aquæ.
> Jam tamen Agrippam natum Remulumque nepotem
> Viderat.' Fast. iv. 45—50.

Diodorus describes Procas as the son of Aventinus; Numitor and Amulius are the sons of Procas according to Livy and Eusebius. Appian, Hist. Rom. i. 2, likewise connects the whole series of Alban kings together as father and son. His account resembles some of the mythical genealogies in the Greek logographers and in Apollodorus. With respect to lineal descent in Greek successions of mythical kings, see the remarks of Mr. Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i. Introd. p. xv.

(53) Upon this rule of historical evidence, see the remarks of the author, in his 'Treatise on the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics,' vol. i. p. 283—9. The irreconcilable discrepancies in the schemes of early Assyrian and Median history, as delivered by the Greek writers, which are pointed out by Col. Mure, Hist. of Gr. Lit. vol. iv. p. 332—6. likewise serve to illustrate the same principle.

(54) Gerlach and Bachofen, vol. i. part i. p. 216.

remarkable example of the sort of evidence which the rationalizing school of ancient history consider as sufficient for proving the reality of alleged events. With respect to the first proof, we may observe that the authority of the anonymous work in which the citation from the Pontifical Annals occurs, is by no means well established,(55) particularly in its quotations, and has been by some (for example, by Niebuhr) altogether denied. But even if the accuracy of the citation is admitted, it is of little weight with respect to events placed three centuries before the foundation of Rome. There is no reason (as we have already shown) for supposing that the contemporary registration of the Pontifical Annals ascended even as high as the commencement of the consular government; and it may be assumed with certainty that the passage in question (even if it existed) was merely a record of the belief existing in the later ages of the Republic.(56) With respect to the second proof, it is quite uncertain whether the passage referred to implies that Cassius Hemina mentioned the line of the Silvii.(57) It is indeed highly probable that Hemina, who lived at the time of the taking of Corinth, and even writers anterior to him, believed in the existence of an Alban line of kings, between Æneas and Romulus. The belief however even of Fabius and Cato, with respect to events supposed to have occurred seven or eight centuries before their own time, could have no weight unless it was supported by credible testimony, coeval with the facts recorded. With respect to the third proof, the events in question are not more entitled to be considered historical than the adventures of Æneas described by Virgil: the subaqueous palace of the impious king Remulus has no better claim to credit than similar stories told of other lakes in modern times.(58)

---

(55) Ejusdem [Silvii Postumi] posteri omnes cognomento Silvii, usque ad conditam Romam, Albæ regnaverunt, ut est scriptum Annalium Pontificalium lib. iv.; Script. de Orig. G. R. c. 17. The account of the miraculous return of the Penates to Lavinium is cited in the same chapter from the same book of the Pontifical Annals, which shows the nature of the accounts which were adopted into that compilation. This other citation of the Pontifical Annals, though equally applicable to the history of Alba, is not noticed by Gerlach and Bachofen. See above, p. 73.

(56) Above, ch. v. § 11.

(57) Quoniam de Homero et Hesiodo inter omnes fere scriptores constitit, ætatem eos egisse vel iisdem fere temporibus, vel Homerum aliquanto antiquiorem; utrumque tamen ante Romam conditam vixisse, Silviis Albæ regnantibus, annis post bellum Trojanum, ut Cassius in primo Annalium de Homero atque Hesiodo scriptum reliquit, plus centum atque sexaginta annis, ante Romam autem conditam, ut Cornelius Nepos in primo chronicorum de Homero dixit, annis circiter centum et sexaginta.—Gell. N. A. xvii. 21, § 3. Compare Krause, p. 167. It is not clear from this passage that either Hemina or Nepos mentioned the Silvii: they may have merely stated the number of years before the foundation of Rome. See a similar remark below on a passage from the Chronicle of Eusebius, note 62.

§ 5 But while, on the one hand, the historical theory of the Alban kingdom is quite untenable, there is, on the other, no good reason for adopting the hypothesis of Niebuhr, that the list of the Alban kings is a late fabrication, the work of Alexander Polyhistor, who lived in the time of Sylla.(59) If the list had been of so late a date as that supposed, it would probably have appeared only in one form, and have undergone no legendary variations. Now there seems, indeed, to have been a list of names, and dates of reigns, which was considered as possessing some authority, but it obtained no exclusive credit; and different lists, wholly inconsistent with it, were, as we have seen, accepted by other writers. It is indeed mentioned by Servius, that Livy followed Alexander Polyhistor, in his account of Tiberinus, the son of Capetus;(60) but we have no proof (as Niebuhr infers) that Livy followed Alexander with respect to the other kings; nor indeed is there any evidence, beyond the suspicion of Servius, that even with respect to Tiberinus, Virgil did not proceed upon the authority of some native writer. The list of Alban kings seems to have been formed as other similar accounts relating to remote antiquity were framed by the Greek and Roman writers, and from materials neither more or less credible.

---

(58) Compare the judicious comments of Schwegler, vol. i. p. 339, 342.

(59) Hist. vol. i. p. 205; Lect. vol. i. p. 24. This is likewise the view of Wachsmuth, Aelt. Gesch. des Röm. Staats, p. 106.

(60) Sed hic Alexandrum sequitur, qui dixit Tiberinum Capeti filium venantem in hunc fluvium cecidisse, et fluvio nomen dedisse. Ad Æn. viii. 330. The inference of Niebuhr is rejected by Schwegler, ib. p. 345; but he agrees with Niebuhr in considering the list of Alban kings a recent forgery. See also Krebs, Lectiones Diodoreæ, c. 7.

The foundation of Alba Longa by Ascanius, the omen of the sow and her thirty pigs, and the period of thirty years, rank among the most popular and generally received of the Roman legends. Alba was at all times regarded as the cradle of the Roman people.(61) The subsequent Alban kings had no great individual celebrity; but several of them are commemorated by Virgil, in his national epic: and the authorized story of the foundation of Rome, which dated back at least from Fabius Pictor, the earliest native historian, was built upon the assumption that Rhea Silvia, the mother of Romulus and Remus, was the daughter of Numitor, the rightful king of Alba; that the founders of Rome were descended from the Alban kings; and that Rome itself was a colony of Alba. It is even possible that the Alban kings may have been alluded to by Euphorion of Chalcis, who flourished in the latter half of the third century B.C., and by Apollodorus; but the passage which suggests this inference is indistinct.(62) There can however be scarcely any doubt that the line of Alban kings, such as we have it, was recognised by the earliest native historians; for Cato, we are informed, placed the foundation of Rome 432 years after the Trojan war.(63) Now as this number agrees almost exactly with the number stated by Dionysius, Diodorus, and others, for the duration of the reigns of Æneas and of the Alban kings,(64) it may be inferred with tolerable certainty that he filled up the interval with a series of Alban kings, similar to that which they adopted. In the time of the Dictator Cæsar, the existence of the kings of Alba was so completely recognised, that their dress was supposed to be known: Cæsar is stated to have used a peculiar kind of sandal, higher than the common sort, and of a red colour, similar to that formerly worn by the Alban kings, to whom he was allied through his ancestor Iulus.(65) Antony, likewise, in his speech over the body of Cæsar, is represented by Dio Cassius as referring to Cæsar's progenitors, the kings of Lavinium and Alba.(66)

---

(61) 'Utque lacus suberant, ubi, quamquam diruta, servat
Ignem Trojanum, et Vestam colit Alba minorem.'
Juven. iv. 60-1.

Strabo, v. 3, § 4, says that after the war between Rome and Alba, the latter city was demolished, with the exception of its temple. Concerning the temple of Vesta at Alba, see Dion. Hal. ii. 65. Tacitus thus describes the funeral of Drusus, A.D. 23. 'Funus imaginum pompâ maxime illustre fuit, cum origo Juliæ gentis, Æneas, *omnesque Albanorum reges*, et conditor urbis Romulus, post Sabina nobilitas, Attus Clausus, ceteræque Claudiorum effigies, longo ordine spectarentur.'—Ann. iv. 9. It is plain from this account that in the popular belief, the Alban kings formed necessary links in the chain which connected Romulus with Æneas. The demand of Juno in Æn. xii. 826-7, likewise implies Virgil's recognition of a long line of Alban kings:

'Sit Latium; sint Albani per secula reges;
Sit Romana potens Italâ virtute propago.'

(62) 'In Latinâ historiâ hæc ad verbum scripta repperimus: Agrippâ apud Latinos regnante, Homerus poeta in Græciâ claruit, ut testatur Apollodorus grammaticus, et Euphorbius historicus, ante urbem Romam conditam annis cxxiiii., et, ut ait Cornelius Nepos, ante Olympiadem primam annis c.' Euseb. Chron. p. 321. By *Euphorbius* in this passage, *Euphorion* appears to be meant; see Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 72. It is, however, possible, that Euphorion and Apollodorus were only cited by the Latin writer alluded to, for the absolute date of Homer, and that the synchronism with Agrippa the Alban king was his own inference. If the χρονικὰ of Castor mentioned in Apollod. ii. 1, § 3, was the same work as that cited in Euseb. Chron. p. 220, it would follow that the list of the Alban kings was earlier than Apollodorus, who flourished about 240 B.C.

The predominance of the Silvian name in the Alban line, from Silvius Postumus, the successor of Ascanius, to Rhea Silvia, the mother of Romulus and Remus, cannot escape notice; and though there is no historical trace of any Alban family of Silvii, yet it seems probable that the traditions which connected this name with the kings of Alba ascended to a comparatively early period of Roman history;(67) certainly to a period lying beyond the time of Sylla.

---

(63) i. 74. Fabius Pictor recognised Numitor and Amulius as the last two of the royal line of Alba. Plut. Rom. 3; Dion. Hal. i. 76—79. Propertius speaks of the Alban kings and their exploits as a proper subject for Latin poetry, comparing it with the subjects treated by Ennius in his Annals; iv. 3, 3.

(64) Above, p. 367.

(65) *καὶ τῇ ὑποδέσει καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐνιότε καὶ ὑψηλῇ καὶ ἐρυθροχρόῳ, κατὰ τοὺς βασιλέας τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ἄλβῃ ποτὲ γενομένους, ὡς καὶ προσήκων σφίσι διὰ τὸν Ἴουλον, ἐχρῆτο.*—Dio Cass. xliii. 43.

(66) xliv. 37.

(67) 'I will not vouch (says Niebuhr) that a Silvian house actually reigned at Alba; the fact, however, was assumed in the Alban records. The existence of such a house pre-supposes that of a hero, Silvius or Silvus.'—ib. p. 207. What the *Alban records*, alluded to by Niebuhr, may have been, is not so clear; particularly as Alba is said to have been

But while we reject as groundless the idea that the line of Alban kings was a forgery of late date, we must, on the other hand, renounce all attempts to extract historical fact out of the legendary materials, of which the narrative of their acts is composed. Thus, when we are told by Niebuhr that the fairy palace of the wicked king Remulus is to be taken as a proof of a change of level in the waters of the Alban lake;(68) that the six hundred curators of the *Sacra*, said to have been sent from Alba to Lavinium, under the leadership of Ægestus, when the Penates had been twice miraculously transported to the latter town, were in fact six hundred families, who migrated from the thirty Latin towns, and the thirty Alban hamlets, to Lavinium; that the account of the colonization of the Prisci Latini from Alba refers, not to these towns, but to a list of thirty Alban townships, said to be preserved in Pliny; that the *Lavines* were equivalent to the *Latins;* but that Lavinium was a more recent city than Alba;(69) we may be permitted to doubt whether any better

---

destroyed in the time of Tullus Hostilius: but if there were ancient recollections of a Silvian house at Alba, it is not easy to see how the list of Alban kings could have been a forgery of late date. Niebuhr, ib., likewise seems to assume the existence of a Latin tradition, that Silvius was founder of Alba. Strabo, v. 3, § 4, describes the royal line of Alba as having been continued down to the destruction of that city, and running for a time parallel with that of Rome.

(68) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 200.

(69) The language of Niebuhr, in proposing these groundless, or, to say the least, wholly uncertain conjectures, is worthy of notice, as illustrative of his mode of criticism, and of his views of historical evidence. 'I am not (he says) bringing forward a hypothesis, but *the plain result of unprejudiced observation*, when I remark, that Lavinium, *as its name implies*, was the seat of congress for the Latins, *who were also called Lavines.* [N.B. This rests merely upon a previous conjecture of his own, vol. i. p. 84, that *Latinus* and *Lavinus* are dialectical varieties.] . . . *The same impartial observation convinces me*, from the number of the six hundred families, that each of the 30 Alban hamlets, and each of the 30 Latin towns sent ten.' Lower down, he says of the account of the towns of the Prisci Latini given by Livy and Dionysius, that though these two writers 'contradict themselves, it was not so with the writers they copied.' This inference is arrived at from the following data. Pliny, H. N. iii. 9, enumerates the names of thirty *populi Albenses* who were accustomed, in the early ages of Rome, to receive a portion of the flesh of the victims on the Alban mount. Hereupon, Niebuhr announces that 'their name of *populi Albenses*, and their number, *speak for themselves*, and *leave no doubt* that these, and not the more important cities, were the thirty places said

ground can be discovered for these conjectures than for other rationalist reductions of mythology, and whether they are not devised in the same spirit of interpretation which converts the labours of Hercules into military expeditions, and discovers a type of commercial enterprise in the voyage of the Argonauts.

§ 6 The story of the Alban kingdom is, as we have already remarked, indissolubly connected with that of the foundation of Rome, according to the native version of both. We therefore pass at once to an examination of the accounts of the origin of this celebrated city.

'There is (says Dionysius) great diversity of statement, both concerning the date of the foundation of Rome, and concerning

---

to have been colonies from Alba.' Nevertheless, as we have already seen, Virgil, Diodorus, and the work de Orig. Gent. Rom. expressly enumerate several of these 'more important cities' among the Alban colonies, and these are the places alluded to by Livy and Dionysius, although, as it is alleged, they did not understand the writers whom they copied. Niebuhr's notion as to 30 Alban townships, independent of the 30 Latin cities, is derived from a new punctuation, and a new interpretation, of a passage in Pliny, H. N. iii. 9. Gerlach and Bachofen and others have, however, shown conclusively that Niebuhr's view of this passage is altogether erroneous; vol. i. part 1, p. 191; also Schwegler, ib. p. 348. The first list contains 21 names; the second 32, making together, as Pliny says, 53 extinct communities in Latium. The Albenses are evidently the people of Alba Fucensis. The whole series of deductions built by Niebuhr upon this passage is unfounded. Having, however, satisfied himself as to his new conclusion, he next proceeds to speculate as to the nature of these Alban towns. 'Many of them (he thinks) may actually have received Alban colonists; . . . but on the whole *it is evident* that there was a division, like that of the 30 plebeian tribes under the legislation of Servius; they were the boroughs of a free commonalty.' Having advanced his conjecture, and illustrated it by additional speculation, he concludes with the following remarks:—'Thus by the present investigation we have gained the same cheering result, which has rewarded the labour spent on many of those comprised in this work. That which seemed to be absurd, was so only while we looked at it superficially; and *it covered a groundwork of uncorrupted truth, which may be brought to light*. Thus history critically treated becomes much *richer in facts*, than the credulous repetition of traditional tales;' p. 201—3. This notion of a profound truth, hidden under the cover of a popular tale, exactly accords with the spirit in which the ancients reduced their mythology into historical fact and ethical or physical allegory: a system of interpretation, which, when it is differently applied, Niebuhr himself strongly condemns; see Hist. vol. i. p. 235. 'The wish of these historians (he there says) was to bring the whole mythical age within the sphere of history; their assumption, that the poetical stories always contained a core of dry historical truth; and their system, to bring this core to light, by stripping off everything marvellous.'

its founders.'(70) 'Many writers (he afterwards adds) have shown who were the founders of Rome, and what were their adventures in making the new establishment, together with other circumstances relating to the settlement; and of these some have differed from the others in the majority of the facts.'(71) One version of the story had however been promulgated by the earliest native historians, and had, with certain variations in particular points, been repeated by nearly all the subsequent Roman writers. It has reached us in the form in which it was narrated by Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, and Cato, during the Second Punic War;(72) moreover, we have reason to believe that the most striking and popular feature of it, the suckling of Romulus and Remus by the wolf, was embodied by the early poet Nævius in a drama,(73) about 230 B.C.: and it is distinctly stated by Livy that the statue of the wolf with the twins was placed by the curule ædiles near the Ficus Ruminalis, and its expense defrayed out of public moneys, in the year 296 B.C.(74) This story is to the following effect.

Amulius, the younger son of Procas, king of Alba, upon the death of his father, usurps the royal power, and reduces his elder brother Numitor to a private position.(75) Numitor however had two grown-up children, a son and daughter; and Amulius, fearing their hostility, or that of their descendants,(76) resorts to measures which appear effectual for his purpose. He causes Ægestus, the son, to be secretly put to death on a hunting party: as to the daughter, Rhea Silvia, he compels her to become a priestess of Vesta:(77) the result of which (as of taking the veil of a nun in modern times) is, that she is bound by a vow of perpetual chastity. By this measure, therefore, all chance of offspring from the single daughter of Numitor seems to be extinguished; for if she breaks her vow, and children are born, the mother and offspring are doomed to instant death.

---

(70) i. 72.

(71) i. 75, ad fin., where διαφόρως, the conjecture of Sylburg, seems to be required.

(72) See Dion. Hal. i. 79, 83, ad fin; Plut. Rom. 3. The account ascribed to Fabius Pictor and Vennonius, in Orig. Gent. Rom. 20, agrees with that ascribed to the former by Dionysius.

(73) Nævius wrote a *fabula togata* on the subject of Romulus; see Klussmann, Næv. Fragm. p. 128. Donatus, ad Terent. Adelph. iv. i. 20. says: 'Falsum est, quod dicitur, intervenisse lupum Nævianæ fabulæ, Alimoniæ Remi et Romuli, dum in theatro ageretur.' This passage shows that the play included the incident of the wolf suckling the twins.

(74) Livy, x. 23. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 293. Cicero speaks, in the following verses from his poem on his Consulship, of a statue of the wolf and twins, which was thrown down by lightning on the Capitol:

> Hic silvestris erat, Romani nominis altrix,
> Martia, quæ parvos Mavortis semine natos
> Uberibus gravidis vitali rore rigabat;
> Quæ tum cum pueris flammato fulminis ictu
> Concidit, atque avulsa pedum vestigia liquit.

De Div. i. 12; cf. ii. 20.

The lituus of Romulus was said to have been deposited on the Palatine hill, and to have been miraculously saved during the conflagration of the city by the Gauls: see below, ch. xii. § 81. But this relic does not admit of being quoted as a historical testimony for the year 390 B.C.

The prevailing version of the foundation legend of Rome represented Amulius as a usurper of his brother's rights: but there was another account which described Procas as having left the inheritance to be divided between his two sons, whereupon Numitor, the elder, voluntarily prefers his father's possessions, and leaves the kingdom to his younger brother. Amulius then adopts the measures just described for consolidating his power.(78) This story again is inverted: for it is also said that Numitor chose the kingdom; but that Amulius, by the possession of his father's wealth and of the gold brought from Troy, soon succeeded in deposing his brother from the throne.(79) A third this kind as instances of human deception, or to believe that, although the gods never mix their race with that of men, there is an intermediate class of demigods, who have intercourse sometimes with divine, and sometimes with human beings.(82) Considering the large number of families in antiquity, which traced their origin to a divine progenitor, and the extent to which the marriages of gods and men were multiplied in the popular mythology, it is natural that this subject should have awakened the inquiries of the philosophers, at the time when speculations on divine things became common ;(83) whichever construction is adopted, however, Dionysius entertains no doubt that Rhea Silvia became pregnant, and soon afterwards bore male twins.(84)

---

(75) Amulius is represented as an usurper of the rights of his elder brother, by Dion. Hal. i. 76, 81; Livy, i. 3; Justin, xliii. 2; Appian, Hist. Rom. i. 2; Dio Cassius, vol. i. p. 5 (who however calls Numitor and Amulius the sons of Aventinus); Servius, ad Æn. i. 273; Strab. v. 3, § 2. Ovid likewise follows the popular view of the subject:

> Hæc ubi cognovit contemptor Amulius æqui,
> Nam raptas fratri victor habebat opes.—Fast. iii. 49-50.
>
> Romuleoque cadit trajectus Amulius ense,
> Regnaque longævo restituuntur avo.—Ib. 67, 8.
>
> Jam luerat pœnas fratri Numitoris; et omne
> Pastorum gemino sub duce vulgus erat.—iv. 809-10.

See also Met. xiv. 772-4.

(76) According to Dio Cassius, ib., Amulius took this step in consequence of a prophecy that he would be killed by the children of Numitor.

(77) Dion. Hal. i. 76; Livy, i. 3; Plut. Rom. 3; Orig. G. R. 19; Strab. v. 3, § 2.

(78) Orig. Gent. Rom. 19.

(79) This account is given by Plutarch, Rom. 3, and is followed by Zonaras, vii. 1.

Rhea divulges the occurrence to her mother; and hereupon a conflict of religious obligations arises. For by the act of one god, she has violated her allegiance to another. Her mother advises her to simulate ill health: and to abstain for the present from her sacred functions, leaving them to be performed by other virgins.(85) The suspicions of Amulius are however ex-

---

Amandi, on the ground that love-scenes occur in all poems—'Even in the rude old Annals of Ennius—a poem quite free from all charge of modern corruption—Ilia is described as yielding to the embraces of Mars.' Appian, H. R. i. 1, says that Romulus and Remus derived their descent, on the mother's side, from Æneas: *τὸ γὰρ τοῦ φύσαντος ἄδηλον βδελυττόμενοι τούτῳ μᾶλλον ἐκκαυχώμενοι ἦσαν.* Justin, xliii. 2, says: 'Igitur clausa in luco Marti sacro, duos pueros, incertum stupro, an ex Marte conceptos, enixa est.'

(82) i. 77. Accordingly Dionysius carefully avoids naming Mars, in his account of the meeting with Silvia. He is merely 'an appearance of the dæmon of the grove'—*τοῦ δαίμονος εἴδωλον, οὗ τὸ χώριον ἦν.*

(83) See above, p. 348. n. 207, in reference to Anchises and Venus. Augustine, after mentioning the belief that Æneas was the son of Venus, and that Romulus was the son of Mars, proceeds thus: 'Dixerit aliquis: Itane tu ista credis? Ego vero ista non credo. Nam et vir doctissimus eorum Varro falsa hæc esse, quamvis non audacter, neque fidenter, pœne tamen fatetur. Sed utile esse civitatibus dicit ut se viri fortes, etiamsi falsum sit, diis genitos esse credant: ut eo modo animus humanus velut divinæ stirpis fiduciam gerens, res magnas aggrediendas præsumat audacius, agat vehementius, et ob hoc impleat ipsâ securitate felicius.' De Civ. Dei, iii. 4.

(84) The foundation legend of the Sabine town of Cures, as related by Dion. Hal. ii. 48, bears some resemblance to that of Rome. A certain virgin, of noble family, dancing in the temple of Mars, is seized with divine enthusiasm, and enters the shrine, where she becomes pregnant by the god. She bears a son, who, when he grows up, is of superhuman beauty, and skilled in all deeds of arms. He becomes the founder of Cures.

(85) Dion. Hal. i. 77.

this kind as instances of human deception, or to believe that, although the gods never mix their race with that of men, there is an intermediate class of demigods, who have intercourse sometimes with divine, and sometimes with human beings.(82) Considering the large number of families in antiquity, which traced their origin to a divine progenitor, and the extent to which the marriages of gods and men were multiplied in the popular mythology, it is natural that this subject should have awakened the inquiries of the philosophers, at the time when speculations on divine things became common ;(83) whichever construction is adopted, however, Dionysius entertains no doubt that Rhea Silvia became pregnant, and soon afterwards bore male twins.(84)

Rhea divulges the occurrence to her mother; and hereupon a conflict of religious obligations arises. For by the act of one god, she has violated her allegiance to another. Her mother advises her to simulate ill health: and to abstain for the present from her sacred functions, leaving them to be performed by other virgins.(85) The suspicions of Amulius are however ex-

---

Amandi, on the ground that love-scenes occur in all poems—'Even in the rude old Annals of Ennius—a poem quite free from all charge of modern corruption—Ilia is described as yielding to the embraces of Mars.' Appian, H. R. i. 1, says that Romulus and Remus derived their descent, on the mother's side, from Æneas: *τὸ γὰρ τοῦ φύσαντος ἄδηλον βδελυττόμενοι τούτῳ μᾶλλον ἐκκαυχώμενοι ἦσαν.* Justin, xliii. 2, says: 'Igitur clausa in luco Marti sacro, duos pueros, incertum stupro, an ex Marte conceptos, enixa est.'

(82) i. 77. Accordingly Dionysius carefully avoids naming Mars, in his account of the meeting with Silvia. He is merely 'an appearance of the dæmon of the grove'—*τοῦ δαίμονος εἴδωλον, οὗ τὸ χώριον ἦν.*

(83) See above, p. 348. n. 207, in reference to Anchises and Venus. Augustine, after mentioning the belief that Æneas was the son of Venus, and that Romulus was the son of Mars, proceeds thus: 'Dixerit aliquis: Itane tu ista credis? Ego vero ista non credo. Nam et vir doctissimus eorum Varro falsa hæc esse, quamvis non audacter, neque fidenter, pœne tamen fatetur. Sed utile esse civitatibus dicit ut se viri fortes, etiamsi falsum sit, diis genitos esse credant: ut eo modo animus humanus velut divinæ stirpis fiduciam gerens, res magnas aggrediendas præsumat audacius, agat vehementius, et ob hoc impleat ipsâ securitate felicius.' De Civ. Dei, iii. 4.

(84) The foundation legend of the Sabine town of Cures, as related by Dion. Hal. ii. 48, bears some resemblance to that of Rome. A certain virgin, of noble family, dancing in the temple of Mars, is seized with divine enthusiasm, and enters the shrine, where she becomes pregnant by the god. She bears a son, who, when he grows up, is of superhuman beauty, and skilled in all deeds of arms. He becomes the founder of Cures.

(85) Dion. Hal. i. 77.

cited; he first sends physicians to report upon the cause of Rhea's malady; but the women declare that it is of a nature which cannot be disclosed to any man. Foiled in this attempt, he employs the queen, his wife, to discover the truth—she penetrates the veil, and informs the king of Rhea's advanced state of pregnancy.

Amulius loses no time in putting her under an armed guard; and having summoned Numitor before the council, accuses him of being privy to his daughter's crime. Numitor denies all knowledge of it, but, having questioned his wife, he defends his daughter's innocence, on the ground that she submitted to the will of a god; and appeals to the prophecy of the birth of male twins, as a test of the truth of her story. Shortly afterwards news is brought that the twins are born; Numitor insists that his daughter's honour is vindicated; but Amulius maintains that fraud has been practised, and that the children are supposititious. The council, seeing that Amulius is inflexible in his resolution, decide to enforce the law, which enacts that an unchaste Vestal is to be beaten to death, and her offspring thrown into the river.(86)

Up to this point of the narrative, says Dionysius, the majority of historians were agreed. But here there was a material discrepancy as to the ultimate fate of Rhea Silvia. For while some said she was put to death, others said that her life was spared, at the intercession of the daughter of Amulius, with whom she had been brought up as a sister; but that she was kept in close imprisonment, until she was released at the death of Amulius.(87)

---

(86) Dion. Hal. i. 78, says that, according to the law of his own time, an unchaste Vestal was to be buried alive. The punishment of a Vestal is mentioned by Livy in the early part of the Republic, ii. 42. See Festus, p. 241, where the old law is said to have been that the Vestal was to suffer a capital sentence, and her accomplice was to be beaten to death. The mode of death for the Vestal is not here specified; but the custom is mentioned in Livy, xxii. 57: altera sub terra, *ut mos est*, ad Portam Collinam necata fuerat. According to Dion. Hal. iii. 67, Tarquinius Priscus introduced the practice of burying alive. See above, p. 150. In Ælian, V. H. vii. 16. Romulus and Remus are called the sons of Mars and Servia (*Σερβία*); which is an error, either of the author, or of his transcribers, for Silvia.

(87) Dionysius leaves it to the reader to decide which of these two

With respect to the destinies of the twins, Dionysius closely follows the narrative of Fabius Pictor, which, he says, Cincius Alimentus, Cato, Calpurnius Piso, and most of the other historians, who preceded him, had adopted. According to this account, the servants of Numitor took the twins in a little skiff or cradle, in order to drown them in the river Tiber, 120 stadia, or fifteen miles, from Alba.(88) On descending the Palatine hill, they found the river in flood, and were unable to proceed further: here therefore they placed the cradle on the water, and left the children to their fate.(89) The ark floated until it was

---

accounts respecting Silvia he shall adopt: *περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς Ἰλίας οὕτω διαλλάττουσιν αἱ τῶν παλαιῶν γραφαί, λόγον δ' ἔχουσιν ὡς ἀληθεῖς ἑκάτεραι· διὰ τοῦτο κἀγὼ μνήμην ἀμφοτέρων ἐποιησάμην· ὁποτέρᾳ δὲ χρὴ πιστεύειν, αὐτός τις εἴσεται τῶν ἀναγνωσομένων*, i. 79. Livy, i. 4, merely says: 'Sacerdos vincta in custodiam datur.' The Orig. G. R. 19, states that she was put to death. Plutarch says that her life was saved by the intercession of the king's daughter, to whom he gives the name of Antho; Rom. 3. Strabo, v. 3, § 2, says that her life was spared.

(88) Nothing can be more distinct and explicit than the statements of the ancient writers, that the river in which the children were exposed and found, was the Tiber. Dionysius mentions its distance from Alba, implying that they were to be carried to a place out of the immediate neighbourhood. Not only Dionysius, but Cicero, Rep. ii. 2, Livy, Strabo, Servius, Dio Cassius, Appian, Zonaras, the Script. de Orig. Gent. Rom., and Ovid, Fast. ii. 387, all specify the Tiber. Plutarch merely says 'the river;' but that he means the Tiber is evident from his adding that they were found at the place called Germalus. Niebuhr, however, represents the ancient accounts in the following form: 'Amulius ordered that the mother and her babes should be drowned in the river;' and by 'the river' he understands, not the Tiber, but the Anio (vol. i. p. 221). The extant writers say nothing about the drowning of Rhea, who is reserved for a different fate; but Ennius is reported to have said that she was thrown into the Tiber by the command of Amulius. See Orelli ad Horat. Od. i. 2, 17; Ennii Fragm. p. 14. Her connexion with the Anio is moreover wholly independent of the exposure of her children in the Tiber. Ovid has related at length the story of Rhea and the Anio: she is supposed to be wandering about in a state of distraction, when she throws herself into the stream of the Anio, and becomes a sort of water-nymph, the wife of the river-god; Amor. iii. 6, 45-82. Compare the story of the apotheosis of Æneas in the river Numicius, above, p. 339. note 176. This legend is alluded to by Servius: 'Tum, ut quidam dicunt, Iliam sibi Anien fecit uxorem, ut alii, inter quos Horatius, Tiberis. unde est *Uxorius Amnis;*' ad Æn. i. 273. According to one form of this legend (alluded to by Horace), Rhea became the wife of the Tiber. *Anien* is the old form of the nominative case, used by Cato. Niebuhr likewise asks why the children are not thrown into the Alban lake: but, fictitious as the story is, it is not inconsistent with itself. The children are understood to be made away with in a place somewhat remote from the king's residence.

(89) According to Livy, i. 4, the Ficus Ruminalis marked the spot

hovered near them, and brought them food.(91) The shepherds, beholding this marvellous occurrence, and seeing in it the interference of a god, drive away the wolf, who retreats slowly, and like a tame animal.(92) They then take up the children, and intrust them to Faustulus, one of the herdsmen of Amulius, whose wife has lately borne a dead child.

In this narrative, however, as it was handed down by the early Roman historians, there was much which violated the laws of historical probability. And hence other succeeding writers, whose canon of belief was less indulgent, had, even before the time of Dionysius and Livy, reduced the supernatural incidents to the standard of everyday life. Those writers regarded the exposure of the children as improbable; while the tameness of the wolf, and her maternal care of the twins, seemed to them an incident too marvellous for real life, and fitted only for the theatre.(93) The account which they gave in its stead was, that

---

vestris belluæ sustentatus uberibus.' Justin, xliii. 2, attempts to suggest a natural reason for the prodigy: 'Sed Fortuna origini Romanæ prospiciens pueros lupæ alendos obtulit; quæ *amissis catulis distenta ubera exinanire cupiens* nutricem se infantibus præbuit.'

(91) The incident of the woodpecker is mentioned in Orig. Gent. Rom. 20; Ovid, Fast. iii. 54; Plut. Rom. 4. Servius, ad Æn. i. 273, adds the parra: 'Sed cum eos Faustulus, pastor ejus loci, animadvertisset nutriri a ferâ, et picum parramque circumvolitare, suspicatus divinæ originis sobolem,' &c.

(92) The Lupercal was a cave on the declivity of the Palatine hill, which was, according to one explanation, connected with the wolf of Romulus. See Dion. Hal. i. 79; where the words τὸ μὲν ἄλσος down to λέγεται are a note of Dionysius. See above, p. 238. The same cause is assigned by Ovid, Fast. ii. 381—422. The Lupercal, however, as well as the Luperci and the Lupercalia, were also traced to an Arcadian origin: they were supposed to have been introduced by Evander, and to be more ancient than Romulus: see Ovid, Fast. ii. 279, 423. Virgil adopts the Arcadian origin for the Lupercal, and Livy for the Lupercalia: the latter is likewise followed by Dionysius, i. 32. See the explanation above, p. 287, n. 67. Plutarch, Rom. 21, is in doubt which origin he ought to prefer. The Arcadian derivation seems to him specious: but then, he says, the Luperci begin their circuit at the place where Romulus was said to have been exposed. This looks as if the rites were derived from the she-wolf. He adds that the difficulty is increased by the nature of the ceremonial: τὰ δὲ δρώμενα τὴν αἰτίαν ποιεῖ δυστόπαστον. Concerning the Arcadian Λύκαια, see K. F. Hermann, Gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer, § 51, n. 10.

(93) ἕτεροι δὲ οὐδὲν τῶν μυθωδεστέρων ἀξιοῦντες ἱστορικῇ γραφῇ προσήκειν,

Numitor having procured other newborn children, substituted them for the twins of Silvia: that the substituted children were put to death by Amulius; while the genuine twins were secretly intrusted by Numitor to Faustulus, one of the king's herdsmen, who was induced to undertake the dangerous charge by his brother Faustinus, a herdsman of Numitor.(94) They added, moreover, that the wife of Faustulus, by name Acca Larentia, who nursed the children, had been a woman of unchaste life, and had hence acquired the name of *Lupa;* and that the fable of the she-wolf suckling the twins, had arisen from this confusion.(95) A festival of Larentalia was derived from Acca Larentia, and the College

---

τὴν γε ἀπόθεσιν τῶν βρεφῶν οὐχ, ὡς ἐκελεύθη τοῖς ὑπηρέταις, γενομένην, ἀπίθανον εἶναί φασι, καὶ τῆς λυκαίνης τὸ τιθασσὸν, ἣ τοὺς μαστοὺς ἐπεῖχε τοῖς παιδίοις, ὡς δραματικῆς μεστὸν ἀτοπίας διασύρουσιν.—Dion. Hal. i. 84. Compare the expression of Livy respecting an alleged marvel at the capture of Veii: Hæc ad ostentationem scenæ gaudentis miraculis aptiora quam ad fidem, neque affirmare neque refellere est operæ pretium; v. 21. So Polybius, ii. 56, contrasts the ends of history and tragedy: the former seeking to instruct by truth, the latter to amuse by specious fiction. Plutarch likewise, speaking of the foundation legend of Rome, says: *ὕποπτον μὲν ἐνίοις ἐστὶ τὸ δραματικὸν καὶ πλασματῶδες.* Rom. 8.

(94) *Φαυστύλῳ*, which stands in the common text, ought to be changed into *Φαυστίνῳ*, the reading of the Vat. MS. Plut. Rom. 10, calls him Pleistinus, which name ought perhaps to be restored in Dionysius.

(95) Dion. Hal. i. 84, The same explanation is mentioned by Livy: Sunt qui Larentiam, vulgato corpore, lupam inter pastores vocatam putent; inde locum fabulæ ac miraculo datum; i. 4; by Plutarch, Rom. 4, and Zonaras, vii. 1, ad fin. According to Orig. Gent. Rom. 21, Valerius Antias adopted this rationalist construction of the tale: 'At vero Valerius tradit pueros ex Rheâ Silviâ natos Amulium regem Faustulo servo necandos dedisse; sed eum a Numitore exoratum, ne pueri necarentur, Accæ Larentiæ amicæ suæ nutriendos dedisse; quam mulierem, eo quod pretio corpus esset vulgare solita, Lupam dictam;' c. 21 (Krause, p. 271). Servius follows on the same side: 'Quod autem a lupâ alti dicuntur, fabulosum figmentum est ad celandam auctorum Romani generis turpitudinem. Nec incongrue fictum est, nam et meretrices lupas vocamus; unde et lupanaria;' ad Æn. i. 273. The expression was in common use in the time of Juvenal:

> Ite, quibus grata est pictâ lupa barbara mitrâ.—iii. 66.

But I have been unable to discover any authority for the assertion of Dionysius, that *λύκαινα* had the same meaning in Greek.

Strabo, v. 3, § 2, says that the common story about the exposure is incredible: we must suppose that some powerful man, among the subjects of Amulius, received the children and brought them up. Plut. Rom. 6, says that, according to the version of those *τῶν εἰκότων ἐχόμενοι μᾶλλον*, Numitor was privy to the act of Faustulus, and paid the expenses of rearing the children.

of the Twelve Arval Brothers(96) was traced to Romulus and the eleven sons of Acca.

The twins, saved from the cruelty of their unnatural uncle, are brought up on the Palatine hill, under the names of Romulus and Remus. Here their education took place among rude and illiterate shepherds: all trace of the cultivated Greek colony, said to have been established on the Palatine hill by Evander, has disappeared.(97) They were even believed to have lived in pastoral huts, formed merely of wood and straw. One of these, cherished as a sacred relic of the founder of the city, was preserved, on the Palatine hill, and repaired from time to time, without any alteration of its original structure.(98) According to another account, Romulus and his brother were sent by Faustulus to the neighbouring town of Gabii, where they were instructed in Greek letters and music, and the use of Grecian arms.(99)

---

(96) With respect to the Larentalia, see Ovid, Fast. iii. 55-8; Festus, p. 119; Varro, de L. L. vi. § 23. With respect to the Arval brothers, Gell. N. A. vi. 7; Pliny, N. H. xviii. 2. There is a strange story, which connects Acca Larentia with a bet of the keeper of the temple of Hercules, a rich man named Tarutius or Carucius, and a bequest of lands to the Roman people. See Macrob. Saturn. i. 10; Plut. Rom. 5. Plutarch distinguishes two Larentias: which is the usual resource of desperate mythologists. Cato told a story about Larentia which seems to have been an explanatory legend for some public lands, and for a monument and annual rites dedicated to her: 'Cato ait Larentiam meretricio quæstu locupletatam post excessum suum populo agros Turacem, Semurium, Lintirium et Solinium reliquisse; et ideo sepulcri magnificentiâ et annuæ parentationis honore dignatam;' Macrob. ib. Also Gell. N. A. vi. 7: Sed Acca Larentia corpus in vulgus dabat, pecuniamque emeruerat ex eo quæstu uberem. Ex testamento, ut in Antiatis historiâ scriptum est, Romulum regem, ut quidam alii tradiderunt, populum Romanum bonis suis heredem fecit. Compare the stories in Herod. ii. 134-5, about Rhodopis, the courtezan.

(97) See Dion. Hal. i. 31-3; above, ch. viii. § 4.

(98) See Dion. Hal. i. 79, where the words ὧν ἔτι down to δύναμιν are a note inserted by Dionysius himself in his summary of the earlier writers. The ἐμὲ is clearly Dionysius. See above, p. 238.

(99) Dion. Hal. i. 84; Plut. Rom. 6; Orig. Gent. Rom. 21. The latter writer adds that the expenses of their education at Gabii were privately defrayed by Numitor; Steph. Byz. in Τάβιοι (an error for Γάβιοι) says: πόλις Ἰταλίας, ἐν ᾗ οἱ περὶ Ῥίμον ἐπαιδεύθησαν. Dionysius does not seem to regard Gabii as more Hellenic than other Latin cities; but assumes that Romulus and Remus might have received a Greek education in any Latin town. The story however is not included in the version which he

Romulus and Remus have now reached the age at which it was appointed by fate that the secret of their birth should be revealed, and an end put to the triumphant injustice of Amulius. When they were eighteen years old,(100) a dispute arose between the herdsmen of Numitor and Amulius; which ended in Remus being taken in an ambush, during the accidental absence of Romulus, and his being led away in chains to Alba.(101) Upon his return, Romulus is informed of the misfortune which has befallen his brother, and is about to fly to his rescue. His eagerness renders it necessary for Faustulus to disclose to him their connexion with the royal house of Alba, of which fact he had been hitherto ignorant. Upon hearing this important intelligence, Romulus decides to make a concerted attack upon Amulius, for the purpose of avenging his own and his brother's wrongs, as well as those of his mother and grandfather. The villagers are ordered to collect in the city of Alba, but to enter

---

seems to adopt. It was doubtless introduced for the purpose of explaining how Romulus, whose youth had been passed among illiterate shepherds, suddenly became a legislator and a statesman, imbued with civil and military wisdom, at the age of 18.

(100) This age is mentioned by Dion. Hal. i. 79. Eutropius gives the same age: 'Is [Romulus] cum inter pastores latrocinaretur, octodecim annos natus, urbem exiguam in Palatino monte constituit;' i. 1. Also Solinus, i. 18, and Dio Cass. vol. i. p. 6.

(101) The circumstance of his being chained, or of his hands being tied, was particularly mentioned by Fabius, Dion. Hal. i. 80. Different causes were assigned for the absence of Romulus. One was that he was gone to offer sacrifices at Cænina; ib. 79. Another was that they were surprised during the celebration of the Lupercalia, and that the troop of Remus was attacked and overpowered, while that of Romulus was at a distance; ib. 80. An account somewhat similar to the last is cited from the second book of the Pontifical Annals. Romulus is described as absent, and the stratagem is supposed to have been used at the suggestion of Amulius—which differs wholly from the story of Dionysius. The contrivance employed is to invite Remus to a game which consisted in trying who could carry farthest, between his teeth, a stone used in weighing wool, with his hands tied behind his back. As soon as Remus is rendered helpless, he is seized, and carried to Alba; Orig. Gent. Rom. 22. This seems to be the explanatory legend of a rustic sport. Livy, i. 5, says that they were attacked by the herdsmen of Numitor, during the celebration of the Lupercalia—that Romulus was able to defend himself, but that Remus was overpowered. Plutarch, Rom. 7, says that while Romulus was absent, on account of some sacrifice—for he was fond of religious acts—Remus was attacked and taken by the herdsmen of Numitor.

it by various gates, in order to avoid suspicion; while Romulus himself is the first to be at the appointed place.

In the meantime, Remus is brought before Amulius, and is accused of numerous outrages by the herdsmen of Numitor. Amulius decides that he is guilty, but hands him over to Numitor, who is the injured party, for punishment.(102) Numitor is struck by his noble manner and appéarance, so superior to those of a mere peasant, and questions him in private as to his origin. On hearing the account of his exposure, Numitor suspects the truth; and asks him whether, if his life is spared, he will assist in an attempt to dethrone the usurper. Remus gladly accepts the proposal, is set at liberty, and soon afterwards joins his brother, whom he meets near the town. The two brothers then repair together to Numitor, when Romulus mentions the proofs disclosed to him by Faustulus, and a recognition takes place. At this critical moment Faustulus reaches Alba, bearing with him the skiff or ark in which the children were exposed, intending to exhibit it to Numitor as a proof of his veracity.(103) He is, however, seized by the guards, and brought before Amulius. On being interrogated, he admits that the twins are alive, which induces the king to make an attempt to seize them, by the indications which Faustulus is able to afford. The time for any such measure is however gone by; the preparations made by Romulus and Numitor take effect; the palace of Amulius is forced by a party of armed men; the few guards are easily disposed of, and Amulius is put to death.(104) Numitor thus recovers his rightful power,(105) and Rhea Silvia is released from her dungeon.

---

(102) This is done by a peculiar application of the *lex talionis*. τῆς δὲ τιμωρίας τὸν Νομίτωρα ποιεῖ κύριον, εἰπὼν ὡς τῷ δράσαντι δεινὰ, τὸ ἀντιπαθεῖν οὐ πρὸς ἄλλου τινὸς μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ πεπονθότος ὀφείλεται.—Dion. Hal. i. 81. The ancient Greek proverb was, δράσαντι παθεῖν (see Blomfield, Gloss. ad Æsch. Choeph. 307); but it did not imply that the punishment should be determined and inflicted by the injured party. Livy briefly mentions the fact, Sic Numitori ad supplicium Remus deditur; i. 5. Likewise Plut. Rom. 7. There was another story, which represented the quarrel of the herdsmen as having been fomented by Numitor, who then complained to Amulius, and demanded that Faustulus and his sons should be given up to him. Hereupon an investigation takes place, many witnesses flock to the city, and Numitor is enabled, with the assistance of the persons thus collected, to make a successful attack upon Amulius; Dion. Hal. i. 84.

(103) According to Plut. Rom. 7, there were some brazen ribs in this skiff, on which some indistinct letters were engraved. Copied by Zonaras, vii. 2.

The immediate motive for the foundation of Rome is related with some discrepancy. Dionysius represents it as suggested and arranged by Numitor, who makes a grant of territory to his nephews, and supplies them with money, arms, corn, slaves, beasts of burthen, and all things necessary for the establishment of a new city. Many of the commonalty were also ready to emigrate; while many noble Trojan families (about fifty of which were still extant in the time of Dionysius) joined the new colonists.(106) Livy and others represent Romulus and Remus as taking the lead in the matter, and wishing to found a new city in the place where they had been exposed and brought up.(107)

---

(104) Dion. Hal. i. 84, concludes his narration by saying—*ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Φάβιον εἴρηται.* Plutarch, Rom. 8, attributes the chief part of the story to Fabius and Diocles of Peparethus, the latter of whom (he says) seems to have first published an account of the foundation of Rome. Compare c. 3. A long passage in this part of Dionysius, beginning at *ἐν ᾧ δὲ οὗτοι* in i. 82, and ending at *δίδωσι τῷ Φαυστύλῳ* in c. 84, is preserved in the Excerpts of Nicolaus Damascenus, Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 409. In this expedition, Romulus, we are told, divided his men into hundreds, and placed at the head of each a man bearing a pole surmounted with a bundle of grass: Plut. Rom. 8; Orig. G. R. 22. This is an explanatory legend of the military division called *manipulus*. A festival legend was also derived from this part of the story of Romulus and Remus by an elegiac poet named Butas, who wrote on the Mythical Causes of Roman Institutions—a work in verse, similar to Plutarch's Quæstiones Romanæ in prose. In the Lupercalia, a part of the ceremonies consisted of a course of naked men, who struck persons whom they met with skins. Butas explained this as a memorial of the joyful course of Romulus and Remus, after the defeat of Amulius, to the spot where they had been suckled by the wolf. Two lines of the poem are preserved.

Ἐμποδίους τύπτοντες, ὅπως τότε φάσγαν' ἔχοντες,
Ἐξ Ἄλβης ἴθεον Ῥωμύλος ἠδὲ Ῥέμος.
Plut. Num. 21.

Butas in Causalibus is quoted in Arnob. adv. Nat. v. 18.

(105) Dion. Hal. i. 85, describes Numitor as resuming his former power, and restoring the lawless and despotic government of Amulius to the former legal state of things: *ἐκ τῆς πρότερον ἐπισχούσης ἀνομίας εἰς τὸν ἀρχαῖον ἐκόσμει τρόπον.* According to this view, the *τυραννὶς* of Amulius being suppressed, the old legal and moderate course of the *βασιλεία* is re-established. This is a Grecian idea. Livy represents the change in a different light. He describes Numitor as convening an assembly of the citizens, and addressing it upon the wrongs which he had suffered from his brother, the part which he had taken in his punishment, the origin of his nephews, &c., whereupon Romulus and Remus salute him as king, and the voice of the multitude confirms their act: 'quum avum regem salutassent, secuta ex omni multitudine consentiens vox ratum nomen imperiumque regi effecit.' i. 6. Compare Plut. Rom. 9. According to Servius, ad Æn. vi. 778, Romulus and Remus shared the government of Alba with their grandfather for one year.

When the expedition for founding the new city is formed, it divides itself into two parties, each under its own leader. Romulus proposes the Palatine hill as the site, Remus prefers a place called Remoria. The question is referred to Numitor, who advises them to resort to the method of auguries. Romulus accordingly takes his station on the Palatine hill, and Remus on the Aventine, or on Remoria. Remus first sees a flight of six vultures, Romulus afterwards sees a flight of twelve. A question, to be resolved only by the College of Augurs, arises, whether the priority of the one augury, or the larger number of birds in the other, was to be taken as the sign of the divine preference.(108)

---

(106) i. 85. Varro and Hyginus wrote works on the Trojan families of Rome: 'Hyginus, qui de familiis Trojanis scripsit:' Serv. ad Æn. v. 389. 'Quod Varro docet in libris quos de familiis Trojanis scripsit;' ib. 704. The subject of the Trojan families of Rome is fully illustrated by Schwegler, R. G. vol. i. p. 334—6. He thinks that the number *fifty*, mentioned by Dionysius, is an exaggeration.

(107) Livy i. 6, says: 'Ita Numitori Albanâ permissâ re, Romulum Remumque cupido cepit, in iis locis ubi expositi ubique educati erant, urbis condendæ.' Plutarch's account is similar; Rom. 9. Cic. de Rep. ii. 3, describes the foundation of the city and the choice of its site as the acts of Romulus himself.

(108) Somef raud is likewise imputed to Romulus, which is variously narrated: see Dion. Hal. i. 86; Plut. Rom. 9. Plutarch says that this event was the origin of the Roman custom of taking auguries, as much as possible, from vultures. He adds that the vulture is the most innocent of all animals: inasmuch as it feeds only upon dead bodies, never attacks any living thing, and abstains even from the dead of its own species: it never injures any vegetable or animal product which is valuable to man. Col. Mure, Journal of a Tour in Greece, vol. i. p. 113—5, has some remarks on the augury of Romulus and Remus; which however he assumes to have been taken from *eagles*. Vultures are still abundant in Greece; but are not found in Italy, except in the Alps. I am not aware of any proof of their existence in ancient Italy. Livy, xli. 21, describes a great pestilence at Rome in 174 B.C, in which many dead bodies lay unburied in the streets, but were not consumed by dogs or vultures. 'Cadavera, intacta a canibus ac vulturibus, tabes absumebat; satisque constabat nec illo nec priore anno, in tantâ strage boum hominumque vulturium usquam visum.' This seems to show that there were no vultures in the country near Rome. Varro, we are told, reported a dictum of Vettius, a Roman augur, concerning the twelve vultures of Romulus, that, as Rome had survived its 120th year, it would attain to a duration of 1200 years. Censorin. de Die Nat. c. 17. Upon

Instead, however, of referring this nice point to the decision of persons versed in augural lore, the adherents of each leader prefer a more summary and violent course. A fight takes place, in which the party of Romulus prevails; Remus is killed; and Faustulus, their adopted father, throwing himself between the ranks, in order to avert the bloodshed, also loses his life. Romulus buries his brother at Remoria; and Dionysius informs us that a stone lion which stood in the forum near the rostra, was called the monument of Faustulus.(109) According to another and more popular story, Remus met his death because, in defiance of his brother's prohibition, he leaped over the wall of the new city. One of the bystanders, named Celer, hereupon gave him a death-blow with the rustic instrument which he held in his hand.(110) The latter story is the explanatory legend of the

---

this, Gibbon has the following comment: 'As early as the time of Cicero and Varro, it was the opinion of the Roman augurs, that the twelve vultures which Romulus had seen, represented the twelve centuries, assigned for the fatal period of his city. This prophecy, disregarded perhaps in the season of health and prosperity, inspired the people with gloomy apprehensions, when the twelfth century, clouded with disgrace and misfortune, was almost elapsed; and even posterity must acknowledge with some surprise, that the arbitrary interpretation of an accidental or fabulous circumstance has been seriously verified in the downfal of the Western Empire.' Decl. and Fall, c. 35. Reckoning twelve centuries from the year 753 B.C. we reach the year 447 A.D. The extinction of the Western Empire took place in 476 A.D.

(109) Dion. Hal. i. 85—7; Orig. Gent. Rom. 23. According to the last writer, Licinius Macer mentioned the deaths of Remus and Faustulus on this occasion, whereas a historian named Egnatius described Remus as not only not having lost his life in this conflict, but as having survived Romulus. Tibullus says:

Romulus æternæ nondum formaverat urbis
 Mœnia, consorti non habitanda Remo.—ii. 5, 23-4.

See Becker, vol. i. p. 294, where there are other accounts respecting the monument of Faustulus. The legend was probably unfixed.

(110) Ovid, Fast. iv. 809—18, describes the augury as being in favour of Romulus, and as being peaceably acquiesced in by Remus. He attributes the death of Remus to Celer, ib. 843. Romulus laments his brother's untimely death:

Dat tamen exequias, nec jam suspendere fletum
 Sustinet, et pietas dissimulata patet.
Osculaque applicuit posito suprema feretro,
 Atque ait, invito frater adempte, vale!—v. 849—52.

For the story of Remus leaping over the wall, see also Dion. Hal. i. 87; Plut. Rom. 10; Livy i. 7. Some said that he was killed by Celer; others, by Romulus himself. Servius, ad Æn. vi. 780, says it is a fable that Remus

Celeres, a body of horsemen who occur in the early Roman history. It likewise served to account for the rule of Roman law, that whoever entered or left a city or camp by scaling the wall, and without passing through the gate, was to be punished with death.(111)

Romulus, having first taken measures for expiating the death of Remus, and the other blood shed in the civil conflict, by causing the people to pass through fires, proceeds to mark out the limits of the new town with a plough drawn by an ox and a heifer—a usage which the Romans still practised in the time of Dionysius. Other peculiar religious rites were also performed; and the day of the foundation, the 21st of April, was celebrated by a rustic festival, in honour of the goddess Pales, called Palilia, which continued to be observed in aftertimes.(112)

The limits of the city said to have been described by Romulus were shown in the historical age, and were called *Roma quadrata.*(113) Another legend however confined it to a square

---

was killed by Romulus for leaping over the wall; but see Servius, ad xi. 603. Arguments are founded upon the supposed fratricide of Romulus, by Cicero de Off. iii. 10, and Augustin. Civ. Dei, iii. 6.

(111) See Plut. Rom. ii. and the extract of Pomponius in Digest. i. 8, 11. Si quis violaverit muros, capite punitur, sicuti si quis transcendet scalis admotis vel aliâ quâlibet ratione; nam cives Romanos aliâ quam per portas egredi non licet, quum illud hostile et abominandum sit. Nam et Romuli frater Remus occisus traditur ob id, quod murum transcendere voluerit. Zonaras, vii. 3, makes this incident the origin of a similar rule with respect to the Roman camp.

(112) Dion. Hal. i. 88; Plut. Rom. 12; Cic. de Div. ii. 47; Plin. H. N. xi. 66; Ovid, Fast. iv. 721—862. This day was called the Dies Natalis of Rome; see Ovid, ib. 806. On the custom of passing through the fire, see Ovid, ib. 781, and Virg. Æn. xi. 785—8. Concerning the Palilia, and its connexion with the foundation of Rome, see Schwegler, p. 444. Compare Solin. i. 19. Et observatum deinceps, ne qua hostia Palilibus cæderetur, ut dies iste a sanguine purus esset, cujus significationem de partu Iliæ tractam volunt. The origin of the festival of Lemuria, or Lemuralia, is also referred by Ovid, Fast. v. 449—90, to the foundation of Rome. He supposes it to have been originally instituted for appeasing the soul of Remus, and to have been afterwards extended to the souls of all the departed. He therefore conceives the primitive name *Remuria* to have been changed into *Lemuria*. This is however a mere etymological fiction: the festival was evidently derived from the old Latin word *lemures*. See Orelli ad Horat. Ep. ii. 2, 209.

(113) See Plut. Rom. 9, and Solin. i. 17-18, where its limits are defined. Compare Dion. Hal. ii. 65. It was recognised by Ennius and Varro. See Becker, vol. i. p. 105—8.

building in front of the temple of the Palatine Apollo.(114) There was a further story that another *Roma quadrata* had been founded by a Romulus and a Remus, of earlier date, different from the sons of Rhea.(115) To attempt, with some recent antiquarians, to reconcile these unfixed accounts, would be a vain labour.(116)

We are informed that L. Tarutius Firmanus, a contemporary of Cicero and Varro, who was deeply versed in astrological science, undertook to cast the horoscope of Rome, starting from the assumption that its birth fell on the 21st of April above mentioned, between the second and third hour, Jupiter being in Pisces, Saturn, Venus, Mars, and Mercury in Scorpio, the sun in Taurus, and the moon in Libra.(117) We learn further that Varro proposed to Tarutius the inverse case of the astrological problem, and required him, from the known acts and adventures of Romulus, to determine the day of his birth.(118) The astrologer did not shrink from the task; and, after making his calculations, he fixed the conception of Rhea at the first year of the second Olympiad, the third hour of the twenty-third day of the Egyptian month Choeak, when there was a complete eclipse of the sun; and the birth of Romulus at sunrise on the 21st of Thoth. He further calculated that Rome was founded by him on the 9th of Pharmuthi, between the second and third hour.(119) By adding eighteen years, the supposed age of Romulus at the foundation of the city, to Olymp. II. 1., we obtain the exact year of the Varronian era; so that we must either suppose Varro to have adopted the calculation of Tarutius as the basis of his chronology, or Tarutius to have fitted his calculation to the era assumed by Varro.(120)

---

(114) Festus, p. 258.

(115) Dio Cass. vol. i. p. 6.

(116) See Schwegler, i. 1, p. 446—8.

(117) See Cic. de Div. ii. 47; Solinus, i. 18.

(118) Varro very properly argued *τῆς αὐτῆς θεωρίας εἶναι χρόνον τε λαβόντας ἀνθρώπου γενέσεως βίον προειπεῖν, καὶ βίῳ δοθέντι θηρεῦσαι χρόνον*, Plut. Rom. 12.

(119) Plut. Rom. 12. A list of the Egyptian months—which were probably used by all *mathematici* of the Chaldæan School in their calculations—may be seen in Clinton's F. H. vol. ii. p. 328.

§ 7 Such was, in its main outlines, and with certain variations introduced to meet the requirements of a more sceptical age, the foundation legend of Rome, as it had been reduced into a narrative form by Fabius Pictor, the earliest Roman historian, and related by him and other subsequent historians of their country as the authentic account of the origin of the Roman state. It was unquestionably accepted and believed by the bulk of the Roman people, in the age of Augustus, as a true history; and Romulus, the founder and first king, was, in their eyes, a real man, not less than Brutus, Coriolanus, or Camillus. Every city in antiquity had its foundation legend, as every family of distinction or political importance traced its pedigree up to a divine or heroic progenitor.(121) The imperial city of Rome, which soon began to subjugate its petty neighbours, and even in the time of Pyrrhus stood pre-eminent among the Italian states, was not likely to remain unprovided with this essential appendage of national dignity.(122) But, like many other cities whose origins were lost in the mists of antiquity, different versions of its foundation got into currency; the evidence for the generally received story was not of such a nature as to command universal assent, or to prevent discordant legends passing into circulation. In the case of Rome there were many such legends, wholly irreconcilable with the detailed narrative which we have above repeated; inconsistent not only with its details, but with its fundamental structure, and implying its entire falsity. Of these the majority emanated from Greek writers; some however even of the native historians seem to have adopted origins inconsistent with the Fabian legend of Romulus and Remus. Dionysius particularly dwells on the great discrepancy in the accounts of the foundation of Rome; and speaks of the labour which he had bestowed upon the study of numerous writings on the subject.(123)

---

(120) Plutarch, ib., says that there was an eclipse of the sun on the day of the foundation of Rome: which was supposed to have been known to Antimachus, an epic poet of Teos. Compare Clinton ad ann. 753.

(121) Neque enim minus credidit recentior Cæsar aviam Venerem, quam patrem antiquior Romulus Martem, says Augustine, Civ. Dei, iii. 4.

(122) This point is touched upon by Livy, in his apologetic allusion to the fabulous nature of the foundation story of Rome. 'Datur hæc venia antiquitati, ut, miscendo humana divinis, primordia urbium augustiora faciat. Et si cui populo licere oportet, consecrare origines suas, et ad deos referre auctores, ea belli gloria est populo Romano, ut quum suum conditorisque sui parentem Martem potissimum ferat, tam et hoc gentes humanæ patiantur æquo animo, quam imperium patiuntur.' Præf. *Ferre* is here used in the same sense, as in the words of Tacitus, Ann. xv. 72: Ex Caio Cæsare se genitum ferebat. Compare, too, Livy's remark, after he had described the measures of Amulius for extinguishing all male heirs of Numitor: 'Sed debebatur, ut opinor, fatis tantæ origo urbis, maximique secundum deorum opes imperii principium.' Ovid, Fast. iv. 31—56, traces the pedigree of Romulus and Remus up to Anchises and Venus, and from Anchises up to Jupiter: so that the line terminates in a god both on the paternal and maternal sides, even without reference to Mars.

The following, then, are various accounts of the origin or foundation of Rome, equally independent of one another, and of the celebrated national legend which has been already recounted:

1 Rome was founded by the Pelasgians, during their wanderings, who gave it the name of *ῥώμη*, from their strength in arms.(124)

2 In early times, some emigrants went from Athens to Sicyon and Thespiæ, a large portion of whom migrated a second time, on account of the want of dwellings, and were driven by the wind to Italy, where they remained, and from their wanderings were called *Aberrigines*. Those of them who were subjected to the united rule of Cacius and Pinarius, gave to the Palatine hill, where most of them settled, the name of Valentia, from the power of the ruler. When Evander and Æneas came to Italy, with a large number of persons who spoke Greek, the name

---

(123) ἀμφισβητήσεως δὲ πολλῆς οὔσης καὶ περὶ τοῦ χρόνου τῆς κτίσεως, καὶ περὶ τῶν οἰκιστῶν τῆς πόλεως, οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ᾤμην δεῖν ὥσπερ ὁμολογούμενα πρὸς ἁπάντων ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς ἐπελθεῖν.—i. 72. ἔχων δὲ πολλοὺς καὶ ἄλλους τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν παρέχεσθαι συγγραφέων, οἳ διαφόρους ἀποφαίνουσι τοὺς οἰκιστὰς τῆς πόλεως, ἵνα μὴ δόξαιμι μακρηγορεῖν, ἐπὶ τοὺς Ῥωμαίων ἐλεύσομαι συγγραφεῖς.—i. 73. ἃ μὲν οὖν ἐμοὶ δύναμις ἐγένετο σὺν πολλῇ φροντίδι ἀνευρεῖν, Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Ῥωμαίων συχνὰς ἀναλεξαμένῳ γραφὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων γένους, τοιάδε ἐστίν.—i. 89.

(124) Plut. Rom. 1. Antiochus, the historian, assumed the existence of a city named Rome in very early times, in the reigns of Italus and Morges, Dion. Hal. i. 73. Above, p. 277.

was changed into Rome. This account is cited from the author of a history of Cumæ.(125)

3 Latinus, the son of Ulysses and Circe, gave the city its name after a sister, who was dead.(126)

4 According to Xenagoras, a writer of unknown date, three sons of Ulysses and Circe—Romus, Antias, and Ardeas—founded the three cities, of Rome, Antium, and Ardea.(127) Another form of this legend was that Romanus, a son of Ulysses and Circe, was the founder of Rome.(128)

5 Æneas came to Italy with Ulysses from the land of the Molossians, and founded Rome; the name being taken from one of the Trojan women, who had been the leader in the burning of the ships. This story is attributed by Dionysius to the author of the work on the Priestesses of Argos (who can be only Hellanicus), to Damastes of Sigeum, and some others.(129) If we could rely on the genuineness of the writings consulted by Dionysius, this would claim to be considered as the most ancient foundation legend; and as being unquestionably earlier than the Gallic conflagration.(130) Aristotle (as we have already seen) was acquainted with the incident of the burning of the ships; but he attributed it to a party of Greeks who came round Malea, and he did not connect it with the foundation of Rome.(131)

6 A party of Trojans, escaping from Troy and anchoring near the Tiber, were compelled by the same stratagem of Romè, one of their matrons, to remain. They were at first indignant

---

(125) Festus in Romam, p. 266, from 'Cumanæ Historiæ Compositor.' O. Müller thinks that Hyperochus, the author of a Κυμαϊκά, of unknown date, is meant; see Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 434. For the emendation of the passage, see Preller, die Regionen der Stadt Rom, p. 153, who reads 'Caci et Pinarii unitarum virium imperio,' for 'Cæximparum viri unicarumque virium imperio.' A writer named Ateius in Serv. Æn. i. 273, asserted that Rome was called Valentia, before the time of Evander, and the same change of appellation is attributed to Evander, in Solin. i. 1. This Ateius seems to be the Atteius Philologus, who prepared an abridgment of Roman history, for the use of Sallust: Sueton. de Illust. Gramm. 10.

(126) Serv. Æn. i. 273. The name of the author is lost.

(127) Dion. Hal. i. 72: Steph. Byz. in 'Αντεια and 'Αρδία. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 527.

(128) Plut. Rom. 2.

(129) Dion. Hal. i. 72.

(130) Above, p. 321, 342.

(131) Above, p. 320.

with her, but finding that their settlement on the Palatine hill prospered, they gave it her name.(132) This account, with the substitution of Greeks for Trojans, is attributed to Heraclides Lembus, who flourished in 181—147 B.C.

7 Romè, the daughter(133) of Italus and Leucaria (or of Telephus the son of Hercules), married Æneas, or Ascanius, his son, and gave her name to the city.(134)

8 Rome was founded by Trojans under Æneas, together with Aborigines, who formed a joint city. This is the account of Sallust.(135)

9 Romè, a Trojan woman, who came with other Trojans to Italy, married Latinus, king of the Aborigines. Romulus and Romus were the offspring of this marriage, who founded Rome, and named it from their mother. This account was given by Callias, the historian and contemporary of Agathocles (about 300 B.C.);(136) and in point of antiquity it is preferable to any of the Roman accounts.

10 Romulus and Remus, the sons of Æneas, and of Dexithea, the daughter of Phorbas, came to Italy. The Tiber being in flood, the other boats were lost, but that which contained Romulus and Remus was saved. The place where they landed was called Rome.(137) Dionysius likewise mentions that some

---

(132) Plut. Rom. i. See above, p. 321.

(133) Fest. p. 269; Serv. Æn. i. 273; Solin. i. 2. See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 168.

(134) Plut. Rom. 2.

(135) Urbem Trojam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere atque habuere initio Trojani, qui, Æneâ duce profugi, sedibus incertis vagabantur: cumque his Aborigines, genus hominum agreste, sine legibus, sine imperio, liberum atque solutum. Hi, postquam in una mœnia convenere, dispari genere, dissimili linguâ, alius alio more viventes, incredibile memoratu est quam facile coaluerint. Cat. 6. The effect of this passage seems to be fairly rendered in the text. The description would be more suitable to the foundation of Lavinium, or Alba, as given in the received accounts, than to the foundation of Rome. Nevertheless, it is possible that Sallust did not mean to deny the story of Romulus and Remus.

(136) Dion. Hal. i. 72. He is confirmed by the account in Syncellus, vol. i. p. 363; ed. Bonn. Festus, p. 269, reports him to have said that Latinus and Roma were both Trojans, and that Latinus founded Rome; but the version of Dionysius is doubtless more accurate. See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 383.

(137) Plut. Rom. 2. The author of this story is not named.

of the Roman historians represented Romulus and Remus, the founders of Rome, as sons of Æneas.(138) According to Agathocles, a writer of a history of Cyzicus, many writers said that Æneas died in Phrygia, and that one of his progeny, named Romus, migrated to Italy and founded Rome.(139)

11 Æneas and Lavinia have three sons, Maylles, Mulus, and Romus. The latter gives his name to the city. This story is cited from a writer named Apollodorus, who is conjectured (though upon uncertain grounds) to be a poet of the later Athenian comedy.(140)

12 On the death of Æneas, his three sons, Ascanius, Romulus, and Romus, divide the kingdom of Latinus into three shares. Ascanius founds Alba and some other towns. Romus founds Capua, naming it from his great grandfather Capys; Anchise from his grandfather Anchises; Ænea, afterwards called Janiculum, from his father; and Rome from himself. The latter city after a time lost its inhabitants, when a second colony was sent to it from Alba, under the lead of another Romulus and another Remus, to recover its former position; so that there were two foundations of Rome; one a short time after the Trojan war, the other fifteen generations, or about 450 years,

---

(138) i. 73. The Etymol. Magn. in 'Ρώμη, states that Rome derived its name from Romus and Romulus, sons of Æneas.

(139) Festus, p. 269. Concerning Agathocles, see below, n. 143.

(140) Festus, p. 266. Grauert proposes to expunge the name *Maylles*, and for *Mulus* to read *Romulus*. Schwegler, i. 1, p. 402, thinks that Maylles may be a corruption of *Æmylia*. The citation is from 'Apollodorus in Euxenide.' Hence it has been supposed that a comedy Εὐξενίδης or Εὔξενις was referred to. This supposition is adopted without hesitation by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 184; but is altogether rejected by Meineke, Fragm. Com. Gr. vol. i. p. 468, and is regarded as very uncertain by Schwegler, i. 1, p. 305, n. 22. There were two comic poets of this name, one of Gela, the other of Carystus. The former flourished 340—289 B.C.; the latter, 300—257 B.C. (Meineke, ib. p. 459—469.) The nature of the citation seems to me to make it probable that one of the comic poets is intended; and at the time of the latter, some confused accounts of Rome had doubtless reached Athens. Two early comic poets named Euxenides and Myllus are mentioned together as having exhibited at Athens; Meineke, ib. p. 26. The text of Festus is in so corrupt a state that little reliance can be placed on such notices.

later. This account is attributed by Dionysius to a Roman authority.(141)

13 Æneas had four sons, Ascanius, Euryleon, Romulus, and Romus. The latter of these founded Rome in the second generation after the Trojan war, with a Trojan population. This account (with which the early part of the preceding story substantially agrees) was given in the work which bore the name of Cephalon of Gergis: and Dionysius states that Demagoras, Agathyllus, and many other Greek writers, agreed both as to the date of the foundation and the founder.(142)

14 Æneas, instigated by a prophecy of Helenus, went to Italy with his granddaughter Roma, the child of Ascanius. When the Trojans settled on the future site of Rome, she first dedicated a temple to Faith on the Palatine hill. A town having been afterwards built on the same spot, it seemed right that, as the first place had been assigned to the gods, the town should be called after her. This account was given by Agathocles, a Babylonian, the author of a history of Cyzicus, whose age is unknown.(143)

15 Romulus and Remus, the founders of Rome, were the sons of a daughter of Æneas, the father not being defined. When Æneas arrived in Italy, they were given by him to Latinus, king of the Aborigines, as hostages for the observance

---

(141) Dion. Hal. i. 73. After the supposed division of the kingdom of Latinus into three shares, no part in the foundation of new towns is in this passage assigned to Romulus. The name *Anchisæ* was doubtless connected by the author of this story with some place in Italy, either from similarity of sound, or some other accidental association. In illiterate times, great liberties are taken with proper names: thus *Crustumerium* was derived from *Clytæmnestra*, and the modern Spanish historians called Syracuse, *Zaragoza de Sicilia*. (Lord Mahon's Hist. of Engl. vol. i. p. 312, 12mo.) The duplication of the foundation of Rome was (as in other similar solutions) intended to reconcile two independent and inconsistent legends. A similar account with respect to a double foundation of Rome, each by a Romulus and a Remus, is given by Dio Cassius. See above, p. 393. n. 115.

(142) i. 72. Concerning Cephalon, see Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 68. Concerning Agathyllus, a poet, Dion. Hal. i. 49, and ib. vol. iv. p. 292. Concerning Demagoras, ib. vol. iv. p. 378.

(143) Festus, p. 269; Solin. i. 3. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 290.

of the compacts entered into with the natives. They were treated with kindness by Latinus, who, having no male issue, bequeathed to them a portion of his kingdom. This account is cited from Roman writers.(144)

16 Romulus, the son of Ascanius, the son of Æneas, is the founder of Rome. Eratosthenes is named as the authority for this version.(145)

17 Romus, the son of Ascanius, or Emathion, is the founder of Rome. Dionysius of Chalcis,(146) a respectable Greek writer, is cited for this account.

18 After the death of Æneas, the empire of Italy descended to Latinus, the son of Telemachus and Circe. He marries Romè, and has children, Romus and Romulus, whence the name of Rome was given to the city on the Palatium. This story seems to be due to a Greek writer named Clinias.(147)

19 Tyrrhenia, the daughter of Æneas, has a son Romulus, who has a daughter Alba. She has a son Romus, who is the founder of Rome. This legend (entirely made up of national names) is quoted from Alcimus, a Sicilian writer, of unknown

---

(144) Dion. Hal. i. 73. Servius, ad Æn. i. 273, vi. 778, distinctly asserts that Ennius made Ilia the daughter of Æneas, and that Nævius made the mother of Romulus the daughter of Æneas. The remark of Schwegler, i. 1, p. 408, that Eurydice, in the speech of Ilia in Ennius, is the wife of Æneas, confirms the accuracy of his report. Diodorus states that some historians erroneously believed Romulus, the son of a daughter of Æneas, to have founded Rome; but this, he adds, is not the fact, for there were many kings in the interval between Æneas and Romulus, and Rome was founded 433 years after the taking of Troy; vii. 3. (ap. Syncell. vol. i. p. 366.)

(145) Serv. Æn. i. 273.

(146) Dion. Hal. i. 73. Plut. Rom. 2, includes among the founders, 'Romus the son of Emathion sent from Troy by Diomede.' See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 393—395.

(147) This account is attributed by Festus, p. 269, to a writer named *Galitas;* for which apparently corrupt name, *Clinias* has been restored from Serv. Æn. i. 273. Clinias refert Telemachi filiam, Romen nomine, Æneæ nuptam fuisse, ex cujus vocabulo Romam appellatam. This account, however, does not agree exactly with that in Festus, for it makes Æneas the husband of Rome, instead of Latinus. Plut. Rom. 2, likewise mentions the legend that Romè, the daughter of the Trojan Romè, who burnt the ships, married Latinus, the son of Telemachus, and that Romulus, the founder of Rome, was the issue of this marriage. See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 366.

date, who composed works upon the history of his own country, and also of Italy.(148)

20 Romus, the son of Italus and Leuctra, daughter of Latinus, founded Rome.(149)

21 Romus, son of Jupiter, founded Rome on the Palatium, and gave it his own name. This simple origin, which may be compared with the legend that Hellen was the son of Jupiter, was related by Antigonus, a Greek writer on Roman history, who appears to have been later than Timæus, but earlier than Polybius.(150)

22 Romus, ruler of the Latins, expelled the Tyrrhenians from the country, and founded Rome.(151)

23 Romulus, the founder of Rome, is the son of Mars and Æmylia; the latter being the daughter of Æneas and Lavinia.(152)

24 A maid-servant conceives, in a miraculous manner, in the house of Tarchetius, King of Alba. Twin sons are born—which Tarchetius gives to a man named Teratius to expose. The story then proceeds as in the received legend of Romulus and Remus. This account (which is partly borrowed from the legend of the birth of Servius) is attributed by Plutarch to a writer named Promathion, which is probably a feigned name.(153)

§ 8 Now, on reviewing the several foundation legends of Rome, amounting to at least twenty-five in number, which have been above collected, we shall find, if we confine ourselves in the first instance to the received story of Romulus and Remus, that it is as well attested, and stands as high in point of historical evidence, as any other portion of the early Roman history. We are expressly assured that it is delivered to us in the form in which it was related by Fabius Pictor, and that Cincius, Cato, Piso, and other of the earliest and most authoritative historians, had adopted it from him.(154) We have moreover good ground for believing that the story of the twins suckled by the wolf was recognised by a public act of the state in the year 296 B.C. Looking only to external testimony, no part of the early Roman history stands on a firmer basis. With respect to its internal probability, there is more ground for objection; the paternity of the god Mars, the preservation of the children, and the affectionate care of the wolf, are circumstances lying out of the ordinary course of nature. The ancients themselves were however fully aware of these stumbling-blocks in the narrative; both Cicero(155) and Livy(156) treat the marvellous incidents in question with scepticism; and at a comparatively early period, all these supernatural occurrences were removed by proper variations in the story, as we have had occasion to show. If we follow the example of many modern historians of Rome, and accept the narrative so softened and reduced,(157) we shall be forced to allow that, in respect both of external attestation and internal probability, the received story of Romulus and Remus stands on an equality with any portion of the history of the regal period; except so far as the later events may be thought likely to have been more faithfully handed down by oral tradition, and as Fabius may seem to have had better means of ascertaining the truth about occurrences which preceded his lifetime by three centuries, than about those which preceded it by five.

---

(148) Festus, p. 266. He wrote Σικελικά, and a book entitled Ἰταλική. Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 296.

(149) Dion. Hal. i. 72. Λεύκτρας for Ἠλέκτρας is the reading of the Vat. MS. In the passage of Dionysius, however, as cited in Euseb. Chron. p. 209, and Syncellus, vol. i. p. 363, the name is written *Leuce* or Λεύκη, which is probably the correct reading, and which Schwegler, i. p. 400, prefers, understanding that *Alba* is referred to.

(150) Festus. p. 266, who calls him, 'Italicæ historiæ scriptor.' See Dion. Hal. i. 6; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 132; vol. iv. p. 305; above, p. 94. The Romans were called simply, 'the race of Romus,' in the poems of the Sibyl; Ῥωμαῖοι Ῥώμου παῖδες, Serv. Æn. i. 273.

(151) Plut. Rom. 2. (152) Plut. ib.

(153) Plut. ib. See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 201. This writer is evidently distinct from Promathidas.

---

(154) See Dion. Hal. i. 79. Plut. Rom. 3.

(155) After having given the received account of the exposure and education of Romulus, Cicero adds: 'Quorum copiis quum se ducem præbuisset, *ut jam a fabulis ad facta veniamus*, oppressisse Longam Albam validam urbem et potentem temporibus illis, Amuliumque regem interemisse fertur.' De Rep. ii. 2. Cicero, however, considers the age of Romulus to have been on the whole a historical age: for he afterwards argues that the belief in the apotheosis of Romulus is the more creditable to him, as compared with other men who had been deified, that the latter lived in ruder and more credulous ages; whereas the age of Romulus, less than 600 years before his own time, already possessed literature and civilization, and at that time men had become less credulous with respect to contemporary events. 'Atque hoc eo magis est in Romulo admirandum quod ceteri qui dii ex hominibus facti esse dicuntur, minus eruditis hominum seculis fuerunt, ut fingendi proclivis esset ratio, quum imperiti facile ad credendum impellerentur. Romuli autem ætatem, minus his sexcentis annis, jam inveteratis litteris atque doctrinis, omnique illo antiquo ex incultâ hominum vitâ errore sublato, fuisse cernimus. Nam si id, quod Græcorum investigatur annalibus, Roma condita est secundo anno Olympiadis septimæ, in id sæculum Romuli cecidit ætas, quum jam plena Græcia poetarum et musicorum esset, minorque fabulis, nisi de veteribus rebus, haberetur fides.' ib. c. 10. Without insisting on the inconsistency of Cicero's view with the express testimony of Livy as to the unfrequent use of writing in the early centuries of Rome, and with the entire absence of all traces of its use on a large scale, we may remark that it would have been more to the purpose if he had pointed out that any contemporary record of the reign of Romulus had been extant in his time.

(156) Quæ ante conditam condendamve urbem, poeticis magis decora

On the other hand, it must not be overlooked that the large number of discordant legends, each one excluding the others, exhibits the character of all in their true light, and shows that they are equally devoid of a historical basis. No one professes to rest on any determinate testimony; and if we look merely to antiquity, we shall find that some of those which are cited from Greek writers, are of an earlier date than can be proved with respect to any account proceeding from a native source. Thus the story that Romè, a Trojan woman, married Latinus, and that Romulus and Remus, the founders of Rome, were their sons, was related by Callias, a Sicilian, about the year 300 B.C., and therefore nearly a century before Fabius: the legend that Romulus and Remus were the sons of Æneas was to be found in Greek writers of a respectable antiquity: Antigonus, who was anterior to Polybius, and wrote professedly upon Roman affairs, called

---

fabulis, quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis, traduntur, ea nec affirmare nec refellere in animo est. . . . Sed hæc et his similia, utcumque animadversa aut existimata erunt, haud in magno equidem ponem discrimine; Præf. Livy uses a similar expression of sceptical indifference, in speaking of a prodigy in the siege of Veii: 'Hæc ad ostentationem scenæ gaudentis miraculis aptiora quam ad fidem, *neque affirmare neque refellere est operæ pretium*;' v. 21.

(157) Thus Hooke, Rom. Hist. vol. i. p. 89, represents Rhea as ravished by Amulius, or as meeting a young lover by appointment. He likewise, p. 90, adopts the explanation of the nickname of *Lupa* having been given to Acca Larentia, 'whose disorderly life (he says) gave rise to the fabulous miracle.' Goldsmith, in his History of Rome, adopts a similar view.

Romus, son of Jupiter, the founder of Rome; and if we are to believe the account of Dionysius, a statement that Rome was founded by Æneas, who came to Italy with Ulysses, was even contained in a work of Hellanicus, who was an early contemporary of Thucydides.

The variety of accounts respecting the origin of cities arose from the national craving after an honourable commencement, and from the absence of any account whose attestation commanded general assent and acceptance. We do not find similar variations respecting events lying within a period of contemporary registration; such as the war of Pyrrhus, or of Hannibal. But when the memory of the event was extinct, and no written record of the fact had been preserved, the imagination of mythologists and antiquarians was actively employed in supplying the void, and manufacturing an article to satisfy the public demand. Thus we have not less than nine different explanations of the name of the city of Capua. It was derived from Capys, the father of Anchises; from Capys, a companion of Æneas; from Capys, a Trojan adventurer, but not a companion of Æneas; from Capys, king of Alba; from Capys, an Etruscan founder, so called from his crooked toes; from Capys, the Etruscan word for hawk, in reference to augury; from Capys, a Samnite general; from the plains (campi) by which it was surrounded; from its being the head (caput) of twelve cities.(158) These are all either mythological fictions, or etymological guesses; no one of which has any claim to be considered as resting on credible historical testimony. Now the different foundation legends of Rome, though, on account of the superior dignity and importance of the state, they have been elaborated with greater care, are, in an historical point of view, composed of precisely similar materials. They are all mere frostwork; which on the first ray of critical investigation, melt away and disappear, leaving behind them not a trace of solid and substantial fact. The whole is equally fictitious; there are no grains of corn in the chaff; no fragments of gold in the sand; no process of historical chemistry can extract truth from any of the stories; their origin and their acceptance as history may to a certain extent be explained, but the facts, such as really occurred, were not registered before they were forgotten, and having once passed into oblivion, they can never be recovered or reproduced.(159)

---

(158) See above, p. 325, note 115. Livy, iv. 37, says that the original name of the city was Vulturnum, and that it did not obtain the name of Capua till the year 423 B.C. If this statement is correct, the derivations from the Trojan Capys, &c., become still more unmeaning. Compare Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 172. The statement attributed to Cephalon of Gergis, by the Etymol. Mag. in Καπύη, that Capua was founded by Romus and Romulus, the sons of Mars, seems to rest on some confusion. (See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 70.)

Hence the question which has been discussed by some modern critical historians, whether Rome was a colony of Alba, and what was the relation in which one city stood to the other,(160) appears to be idle and insoluble. The materials for such a discussion do not exist. Dionysius, indeed, considers Rome as an Alban colony;(161) but if we suppose Amulius, and Numitor, and Rhea, and Romulus, and Remus, and all the actors in his drama, to be fabulous and unreal, we cannot retain the outlines of a story from which all the essential parts, all the vital and moving forces, have been extracted. On the other hand, we are not justified in rejecting the express statement of Dionysius, and preferring to it a hypothesis which rests on evidence equally legendary and fictitious.

§ 9 We may however properly inquire what was the origin of the received account, and how it came to pass into such general acceptance among the Roman people.

---

(159) Schwegler, i. 1, p. 66, says that the true tradition of the beginning of Rome was lost at an early period. He considers it probable that at the time of the Decemvirate, the Romans knew nothing certain of the origin of their state.

(160) See Schwegler, vol. i. p. 452—8, and the writers quoted by him. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 207, says that 'the Roman tradition did not represent the Romans as a colony from Alba.'

(161) Dion. Hal. i. 71. *ἀποικίαν στείλαντες Ἀλβανοί, Ῥωμύλου καὶ Ῥώμου τὴν ἡγεμονίαν αὐτῆς ἐχόντων, κτίζουσι Ῥώμην.* Again, in c. 73, a legend is mentioned according to which Rome had a double foundation, the second by an Alban colony. The speeches in the third book likewise assume that Alba is the metropolis, and Rome the colony. See iii. 10, 11, 23, 28.

There is every reason to suppose that the legend, as reported by Fabius, was in the main of indigenous growth. The name of the city itself was probably allied with the Latin word *ruma;* this the Greeks converted into Ῥώμη;(162) which, being a word of good omen, gradually became the received appellation.(163) *Romulus*, or as his twin brother is called, *Romus*, is nothing more than the personified form of *Roma*.(164) Romulus is to the Romans what Hellen was to the Hellenes, Dorus to the Dorians, Ion to the Ionians, Æolus to the Æolians, Chaon to the Chaonians, Sicelus to the Sicilians, Italus to the Italians, Latinus to the Latins. He is the eponymous hero of the state—a mere national entity, without any individual character. Upon this narrow basis, a detailed narrative has been built, which was doubtless formed by a series of successive accretions. Fabius, who seems first to have reduced the legend into the form of a connected story, wrote in Greek, and was acquainted with Greek literature.(165) He would, therefore, naturally give it a Hellenic tinge. The fable of Æneas had likewise by this time been connected with Latium; and the fabulous age of Rome had been engrafted into the Trojan cycle. Hence Greek and Trojan names were introduced into the list of the Alban kings. Rhea Silvia bore a name which carried the thoughts to Asia Minor; and her designation of Ilia was a reminiscence of Troy.(166) The mention of vultures in large flights, in the account of the auguries of the two brothers, seems likewise to savour of a Greek origin; for vultures, though often seen in ancient Greece, probably never descended upon the lowlands of Italy.(167) It is however stated by Dio Cassius that Augustus, in his first consulship (43 B.C.), upon entering the Comitia in the Campus Martius, saw six vultures, and that he afterwards saw twelve other vultures, when he was haranguing the soldiers. It is added that he referred this augury to that of Romulus, and interpreted it as portending that he would obtain the same supreme power.(168) The same historian mentions, soon afterwards, among the prodigies, that a flock of vultures was seen sitting upon the temples of Genius Publicus and Concord, in Rome.(169) How far these accounts of prodigies are to be believed, even in the time of Augustus, it is difficult to decide.

---

(162) The name of Romulus was derived by the ancients both from ῥώμη and *ruma;* see Plut. Rom. 6; Orig. G. R. 21.

(163) See Becker, ii. 1, p. 13; Schwegler, i. 1, p. 419-20. The latter considers *ruma* as alluding to the productiveness of the soil. It might have been derived from the shape of the hills on which Rome was built. It is well known that *u* and *o* were easily interchangeable in Latin. In Italian, *o* has in numerous instances taken the place of the Latin *u*. See Diez, Romanische Grammatik, vol. i. p. 146.

(164) Concerning the formation of the name Romulus, see Schwegler, ib. p. 418. The Greek writers almost always call Remus Ῥῶμος, which is only a variety of Romulus. In like manner, the Alban king whom Livy calls Romulus Silvius, is by others denominated Remulus or Aremulus. Antigonus said that Rome was founded by Romus, son of Jupiter: above, p. 401. Here there is no question of twins; and the legend was equivalent to saying that Dardania was founded by Dardanus, or that Troy was founded by Tros. (Iliad, xx. 216—230.) The Latin word *Remus* is shown by its quantity to be formed from some other root: whether it was connected with a place called Remoria, or Remonia, is uncertain: see Schwegler, ib. p. 438-40. The herdsman who is called Faustulus in the common account, is named Faustus in Plutarch. Parallel. c. 36.

(165) Above, ch. iii. § 7.

---

(166) Concerning the name of Rhea Silvia, or Ilia, see Schwegler, ib. p. 426—30. Rhea is probably the original name; Silvia merely marks her descent from the Silvian gens. Ilia seems to be a variation of Silvia, introduced in order to suggest the connexion with Æneas. Niebuhr's supposition that *Rhea* is a corruption of the editors, that the word ought to be written *Rea*, and is equivalent to *rea femmina* in Boccaccio, seems quite unfounded; Hist. vol. i. p. 211; See Schwegler, p. 428, n. 9. The priestess Rhea, in Virgil, Æn. vii. 659, is thus written, and not Rea, in the Medicean MS. Schwegler, ib. 429, thinks that none of the three names are very old. What their antiquity may be, in the imperfect state of our information, it is impossible to decide, but the name Ilia is as old as Ennius, and Rhea Silvia or Ilia as old as Fabius.

(167) The vulture, and its habit of feeding on dead bodies, must have been known familiarly to the Homeric Greeks. See, for example, Iliad, xi. 162. It is often coupled with the dog, in this respect. The vulture is still common in the mountainous parts of Greece. See above, n. 108.

(168) xlvi. 46.

(169) Ib. xlvii. 2. Concerning the temple of Genius Publicus, or Genius Populi Romani, (which was in the forum), see Becker, vol. i. p. 344. Concerning the temple of Concord, see ib. p. 311. A story, similar to that of the birth, exposure, and preservation of Romulus and Remus, is told in Plut. Parallel. c. 36, of Phylonome, daughter of Nyctimus and Arcadia, from Zopyrus the Byzantian, in the third book of his histories. The river is Erymanthus, the herdsman is named Tyliphus, the twins are Lycastus and Parrhasius. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 531. Some accounts of boys carried away by wolves in India, and nurtured by them, have been recently published; see a pamphlet on the subject (Plymouth, 1852), reported to have been written by Col. Sleeman, the substance of which is given in Notes and Queries, vol. x. p. 62-5. These accounts, however, are so obscure and ill-attested, as well as marvellous, that our belief must be suspended until the subject receives further investigation.

There is also a remarkable resemblance between the story of the exposure of Cyrus, in Herodotus, and of his delivery to a herdsman, whose wife's name suggested the idea that he had been suckled by a dog,(170) and the received story of Romulus and Remus. Atalanta, in the Greek mythology, is likewise described as having been exposed by her father, and suckled by a she-bear, whose cubs had been slain by hunters, and from whose maternal care the same hunters afterwards removed her, like the shepherds in the Roman story.(171)

On the other hand, there seems good reason for suspecting that Plutarch was mistaken in the comparative ages of Fabius Pictor and Diocles of Peparethus; and that although the latter may have first published to the Greeks an account of the foundation of Rome, he had derived it from some Roman writer.

---

(170) See Herod. i. 107—22. The name of the herdsman's wife was *Κυνὼ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων γλῶσσαν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Μηδικὴν Σπακώ.*—i. c. 110. Herodotus adds that Cyrus was always praising Cyno, and that her name was always in his mouth: *οἱ δὲ τοκέες παραλαβόντες τὸ οὔνομα τοῦτο, ἵνα θειοτέρως δοκέῃ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι περιεῖναί σφι ὁ παῖς, κατέβαλλον φάτιν ὡς ἐκκείμενον Κῦρον κύων ἐξέθρεψε.*—c. 122. The probability is that this last sentence is an inversion of the truth; that the story of the suckling by the dog was the more ancient, and the story of the herdsman's wife named Spaco or Kyno, was the rationalized version. Col. Mure, Hist. of Lit. of Gr. vol. iv. p. 338, does not doubt that the story in Herodotus is the prototype of the Roman fable concerning Romulus and Remus. There is certainly a close agreement even in some of the details; thus Dionysius says that Faustulus finds his wife having recently been brought to bed, and delivered of a dead child: *τετοκυῖαν δὲ καταλαβὼν καὶ ἀχθομένην ὅτι νεκρὸν αὐτῇ τὸ βρέφος ἦν.*—i. 79. In Herod. i. 112, the wife of Mitradates, the herdsman, says to him: *τέτοκα γὰρ καὶ ἐγὼ, τέτοκα δὲ τεθνεός.* The fable of the she-wolf is to be found in other nations, remote from Rome. 'Like Romulus, the founder of that martial people [the Turks] was suckled by a she-wolf, who afterwards made him the father of a numerous progeny; and the representation of that animal in the banners of the Turks preserved the memory, or rather suggested the idea, of a fable, which was invented, without any mutual intercourse, by the shepherds of Latium and those of Scythia.' Decl. and Fall, c. 42. (vol. v. p. 233.)

(171) See Apollod. iii. 9. § 2. Ælian Var. Hist. xiii. 1. The descriptions agree closely in some points. Thus Ælian says: *ὑπὸ κυνηγετῶν ἀφῃρημένη τὰ ἑαυτῆς βρέφη, ἄρκτος ἦλθε, σφριγώντων αὐτῇ τῶν μαζῶν, καὶ βαρυνομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ γάλακτος.* On the other hand, Dionysius says of the wolf. *λύκαινα δέ τις ἐπιφανεῖσα, νεοτόκους σπαργῶσα τοὺς μαστοὺς ὑπὸ γαλακτὸς, ἐδίδου τὰς θηλὰς τοῖς στόμασιν αὐτῶν.*—i. 79.

The entire silence of Dionysius upon Diocles, notwithstanding his learned researches into the subject, and his extensive acquaintance with the historical literature of his own country, seems to exclude the supposition that this writer could have really had the importance which Plutarch assigns to him.(172) The substance of the Roman foundation legend is doubtless of domestic manufacture. None but a native would have known what were the chords of feeling on which to strike; what were the customs and institutions to interweave in the fictitious tissue. The double founders, whose rivalry for power soon leads to a fatal conflict, may perhaps have been suggested by the institution of the double consuls, and their frequent dissensions. The twin brothers, who founded the Doric state of Sparta, were in like manner suggested by the existence of a double royal line in that state; and they were, moreover, supposed to have lived in perpetual discord, as was the case with their descendants after them.(173) Other portions of the narrative serve to explain, and find a dignified and antique origin for, various institutions and rites; such as the worship of Vesta, the sanctity of the Vestal virgins, the Lupercalia, the Larentalia, the Lemuria, the Arval Brothers, the Manipuli, the use of auguries, the auspices, and other ceremonies at the foundation of colonies, the Palilia, the sanctity of walls and ramparts.(174) The origin of such unhistorical legends cannot however be completely explained. We may be able to prove that a narrative is insufficiently attested, and unsupported by credible evidence, without being able to discover how it was formed. In such inquiries, the main object is to find a sure criterion for discriminating between truth and fiction; provided this be obtained, we must rest satisfied if, in many cases, we are unable to detect the process by which the fabulous narrative was compounded.(175)

---

(172) See this subject well discussed in Schwegler, ib. p. 411—5. Compare Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 74, where the reader should observe that the restored passage of Festus is of no authority. The remark of Nägele (in Schwegler, p. 414), that ἐπακολουθεῖν in Plut. Rom. 3, may mean merely that Diocles and Fabius followed the same story, is of no weight; for Plutarch removes all uncertainty by his subsequent statement: ὧν τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ Φαβίου λέγοντος, καὶ τοῦ Πεπαρηθίου Διοκλέους, ὃς δοκεῖ πρῶτος ἐκδοῦναι Ῥώμης κτίσιν.—c. 8, ad fin. The testimony of Plutarch cannot be removed by the arguments of Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 212, as Müller, ad Fest. p. 268, has remarked.

(173) τούτους ἀνδρωθέντας, αὐτούς τε ἀδελφεοὺς ἐόντας, λέγουσι διαφόρους εἶναι τὸν πάντα χρόνον τῆς ζόης ἀλλήλοισι, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τούτων γενομένους ὡσαύτως διατελέειν. Herod. vi. 52. Compare Paus. iii. 1, § 8, 9.

(174) On this class of legends, in the Roman historical fictions, see the excellent remarks of Schwegler, i. 1, p. 69.

---

(175) See Schwegler, ib. p. 148, who appears to exaggerate the importance of explaining the genesis of fables in history. Everything is unimportant, as compared with the distinction between truth and fiction.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SEVEN KINGS OF ROME.

PART I.—THE REIGNS OF RÔMULUS, NUMA, TULLUS HOSTILIUS, AND ANCUS MARCIUS.

§ 1 ROME is now supposed to have been founded, and to have received the name of its founder.(1) A detailed narrative, similar to that which is handed down to us respecting the birth of Romulus, and his subsequent appearance as the founder of a new city, is continued to the end of his reign; at greater length by Dionysius and Plutarch, and more concisely by Livy; but by all with entire faith in the reality of Romulus, and in the general credibility of his history. Cicero likewise, who introduces a sketch of the reign of Romulus in his dialogue *de Republicâ*, regards it as completely historical.(2)

According to the account of Dionysius, Romulus, as soon as the walls and buildings of the new city are completed, convenes an assembly of the citizens, to whom he addresses an admonitory harangue on forms of government and the choice of a constitution, leaving the matter entirely in their hands. They consider the question by themselves, and afterwards inform him that they wish to adhere to their ancestorial form of a regal government—a government which has given them liberty at home and dominion abroad.(3) This answer implies that they consider themselves as colonists of Alba. Romulus signifies his willingness to accept the proffered honour, if the choice of the people is confirmed by the will of the gods. He accordingly takes the auspices; and the lightning flashes from left to right, which is a favourable sign. Romulus is then formally elected king, and the custom remained, even after the abolition of royalty, to take the auspices whenever magistrates were elected.(4)

---

(1) Dion. Hal. ii. 2. Ῥωμύλος—οἰκιστὴς γίνεται τῆς πόλεως, καὶ τοὔνομα αὐτῇ τῆς ἰδίας κλήσεως ἐπώνυμον τίθεται. Cic. de Rep. ii. 7. Nam et urbem [Romulus] constituit, quam e suo nomine Romam jussit nominari; Livy, i. 7. Condita urbs conditoris nomine appellata.

(2) De Rep. ii. 10. See above, p. 402, n. 155.

(3) Dion. Hal. ii. 3-4. Livy, i. 7, merely says, after describing the death of Remus. 'Ita solus potitus imperio Romulus.' He afterwards convenes an assembly, but not in order to consult it; c. 8.

His next act, according to Dionysius, is to divide the people into three tribes, and each tribe into thirty curiæ. The territory is at the same time distributed into thirty lots, one lot being assigned to each curia; a portion is also reserved for sacred and public purposes.(5) Livy speaks of the division of the people into Ramnenses, Titienses, and Luceres; but he places it at a later period, in the joint reign of Romulus and Tatius, and he calls them not tribes, but centuries of knights. He likewise refers the institution of the thirty curiæ to the same time.(6) Cicero and Plutarch give the same account; all three derive the Ramnenses from Romulus, and the Titienses from Tatius. The

---

(4) Ib. ii. 5, 6. Dionysius says that the practice of taking the auspices had become a mere empty form in his time, but he deplores its disuse, and thinks that the neglect of it has been the cause of many military disasters. He concludes with this remark: *ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ μὲν τῆς εἰς τὸ δαιμόνιον ὀλιγωρίας, ᾗ χρῶνταί τινες ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις, πολὺ ἂν ἔργον εἴη λέγειν*; c. 6. Cicero likewise dwells upon the importance of the institution of auspices by Romulus: 'Tunc, *id quod retinemus hodie magnâ cum salute reipublicæ*, auspiciis plurimum obsecutus est Romulus. Nam et ipse, quod principium reipublicæ fuit, urbem condidit auspicato, et omnibus publicis rebus instituendis, qui sibi essent in auspiciis, ex singulis tribubus singulos coöptavit augures;' De Rep. ii. 9. 'Ac Romulus cum septem et triginta regnavisset annos, et *hæc egregia duo firmamenta reipublicæ peperisset*, auspicia et senatum, tantum est consecutus,' &c.; ib. 10. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 440. The lituus of Romulus was a relic in later times; it was said to have been preserved unhurt in the Gallic conflagration. Above, p. 151, n. 70. Cicero says that Romulus was himself a skilful augur: 'Principio, hujus urbis parens, Romulus, non solum auspicato urbem condidisse, sed ipse etiam optimus augur fuisse traditur;' De Div. i. 2; cf. ii. 33. He adds that the ancient kings were all versed in augury: 'Omnino apud veteres, qui rerum potiebantur, iidem auguria tenebant. Ut enim sapere, sic divinare regale ducebant;' i. 40. See above, p. 353, n. 3.

(5) Dion. Hal. ii. 7. Dionysius praises the equality of this division of the territory. It may be compared with the equal division of the territory of Laconia, ascribed to Lycurgus, which Mr. Grote has proved to be fabulous.

(6) Livy, i. 13 and 36; In x. 6, forgetting what he had previously written, he calls them 'tres antiquæ tribus.'

Luceres are said, by Cicero and others, to have been named after Lucumo, an Etruscan general who fought with Romulus in the Sabine war. Plutarch traces the name to *Lucus*, which he connects with the asylum.(7) There is another etymological attempt, which finds the origin of Luceres in Lucerus, a king of Ardea, who assisted Romulus in his war against Tatius.(8) Lastly, a conjecture, differing from all the others, assigned them a Tuscan origin.(9)

A further division of the people instituted by Romulus, was that into Patres, or Patricians, and Plebeians. He made the latter clients of the former, and established the system of patronship. Dionysius considers the measures taken by Romulus for combining the higher and lower orders of the people, and for preventing discord between them, to have been so effectual that no sanguinary civil conflict occurred for 630 years, when Caius Gracchus first spilt the blood of citizens.(10) Romulus further created a senate, to assist him with its deliberations. Cicero describes it as having been jointly chosen by Romulus and Tatius.(11) Livy likewise represents it as nominated by Romulus.(12) Dionysius however says that it consisted originally of

---

(7) Cic. de Rep. ii. 8; Plut. Rom. 20. The derivation of Ramnenses and Titienses from Romulus and Tatius is as old as Ennius; Varro de L. L. v. 55. That of Luceres from Lucumo is quoted by Varro from a writer named Junius. It appears to be followed by Propert. iv. 1, 29-31. Other passages relating to the subject are collected by Becker, ii. i. p. 26-31; Schwegler, i. 1, p. 497.

(8) Festus, p. 119.

(9) Varro, ubi sup., referring to Volnius.

(10) Dion. Hal. ii. 8-11. He points out the permanence of the *jus patronatûs*: *ἦν δὲ τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου τότε ὁρισθέντα μέχρι πολλοῦ παραμείναντα Ῥωμαίοις ἔθη περὶ τῆς πατρωνίας τοιάδε* c. 10: *τοιγάρτοι διέμειναν ἐν πολλαῖς γενεαῖς οὐδὲν διαφέρουσαι συγγενικῶν ἀναγκαιοτήτων αἱ τῶν πελατῶν τε καὶ προστατῶν συζυγίαι*, ib. Plutarch, Rom. 13, mentions a derivation of *patronatus* from Patron, a companion of Evander, who was distinguished by his benevolence towards the inferior class of persons. He himself however considers the word to be derived from *pater*. Compare Livy, i. 8. Cicero, Rep. ii. 9, says of Romulus: 'Habuit plebem in clientelas principum descriptam.'

(11) Quamquam cum Tatio in regium consilium delegerat principes, qui appellati sunt propter caritatem patres; De Rep. ii. 8; cf. 9.

(12) Centum creat senatores: sive quia is numerus satis erat, sive quia soli centum erant qui creari Patres possent; i. 8. Compare Plut. Rom. 13; and his guesses about the origin of the name *patricii*.

100 members, who were chosen in the following manner; namely, one by Romulus himself, three by each of the three tribes, and the same number by each of the thirty curiæ ;(13) this number, he adds, was afterwards doubled, by the election of the curiæ, when the accession of the Sabines took place. Nearly all the Roman historians agreed as to this fact, though some said that the addition then made to the Senate was of 50, and not 100 members.(14) Nevertheless, Livy knows nothing of the increase of the Senate under Tatius, and describes it as still composed of only 100 members at the accession of Numa.(15) These fluctuations in the accounts prove that no certain traditions had been preserved respecting the constitution of the primitive Senate.

Romulus is further described as constituting a body-guard named *Celeres*, consisting of 300 men, ten appointed by each curia. Their name was either derived from the celerity of their motions, or, according to Valerius Antias, from the name of their leader.(16) Celer is likewise the name given to the person who is described as the slayer of Remus.(17)

The functions of the king are described by Dionysius as similar to those of the early Greek kings, and not unlimited like those of later times.(18) He had the superintendence of all things concerning religion; he was supreme commander in war, and he had a contentious jurisdiction in questions of minor importance. He convened the Senate, and presided over its proceedings; when thus assembled, it could decide on all legislative, judicial, and administrative affairs of moment, referred to it by the king, whose duty it was to carry its decrees into effect. The king likewise could convene the popular assembly, which voted by curiæ, and had the power of appointing magistrates, of sanctioning laws, and of deciding concerning war and peace. Its decisions, however, were not valid without the consent of the Senate.(19) The king administered justice publicly in the market-place, accompanied by his body-guard of 300 celeres, and by twelve lictors, who carried each a bundle of rods and an axe, for corporal punishment and decapitation—punishments which were immediately executed in sight of the people.(20)

---

(13) ii. 12. Becker, ib. p. 340, considers this a mere arbitrary calculation, by which the Senate is brought into relation with the three tribes and the thirty curiæ.

(14) *περὶ μὲν τούτων ὀλίγου δεῖν πάντες οἱ συγγράψαντες τὰς Ῥωμαϊκὰς ἱστορίας συμπεφωνήκασιν*; ii. 7. Plutarch, Rom. 20, describes the Senate as increased to 200 after the arrival of Tatius; in Num. 2, following another account, he makes it consist of 150 members, at the accession of Numa. Compare Becker, ib. p. 342.

(15) i. 17.

(16) Dion. Hal. ii. 13; Livy, i. 15; Plut. Rom. 26. Compare Becker, ib. p. 239.

(17) Dion. Hal. i. 87. Serv. Æn. xi. 603, says: 'Quos celeres appellavit vel a celeritate, vel a duce Celere, qui dicitur Remum occidisse, in cujus gratiæ vicem a Romulo fieri tribunus equitum meruit.' Plut. Rom. 10; Ovid, Fast. iv. 837—44. Compare Schwegler, ib. p. 387, n. 13.

(18) ii. 12; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 652. Aristotle, Pol. iii. 14, says of the Greek heroic king: *στρατηγὸς γὰρ ἦν καὶ δικαστὴς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ τῶν πρὸς θεοὺς κύριος*. Compare Grote, vol. ii. p. 84.

According to the view of Dionysius, the civil divisions instituted by Romulus likewise sufficed for war. The captains of tribes, curiæ, and a subordinate division of decuriæ, mustered their men when they received notice, and assumed a military command.(21) Plutarch, however, says that Romulus instituted the legion, forming it of 3000 foot and 300 horse, which numbers, after the junction of the Sabines, were doubled.(22)

The colonial system of Rome is further traced to Romulus. He is described as having introduced a humaner treatment of conquered nations than that practised by the Greeks. Instead of putting to death all the adult males, selling the rest of the population for slaves, and leaving the country to be pastured only by sheep, Romulus introduced the usage of sending Roman colonists to occupy a portion of the territory, and of leaving the rest of the population undisturbed.(23) The colonial and municipal system of Rome, by which conquered countries were incorporated, on tolerably advantageous terms, with the paramount state, is regarded by Dionysius as constituting a great superiority in the policy of the Romans over that of the Greeks.(24)

---

(19) ii. 14. Dionysius adds that in his time the relations of the Senate and people were inverted; for that the people had a veto on the decisions of the Senate.

(20) Dion. Hal. ii. 29. Plutarch. Rom. 26, says that Romulus was attended by lictors, whose name was derived from *ligare:* he thinks however that the original name was *litores*, which was derived from the Greek λειτουργοί. Livy, i. 8, says that Romulus assumed twelve lictors, as a mark of authority—the number being taken from his twelve vultures; or, as Livy thinks more probable, they were imitated from the Etruscans, whose king, elected by the twelve populi, had a lictor for each.

(21) Ib.

(22) Rom. 13, 20. He derives the name legion from its being composed of picked men (λογάδες). Compare Varro, de L. L. v. 87; vi. 66.

The religious institutes of the Romans likewise excite the admiration of Dionysius. There are in the Roman ritual no immoral ceremonies and practices, such as abound in the Greek religion; moreover, the Roman theology is free from the disgusting and mischievous legends about the gods, which form so large a part of that of Greece. Even when foreign rites are admitted into Rome, they are so regulated and purified, that their evil effect is neutralized. Dionysius admits that some of the religious legends of the Greeks have a good tendency, and have been invented with a view to utility; but his general judgment of them is not more favourable than that of an Epicurean philosopher; whereas he considers the Roman religion as founded on sound moral principles, and as conducive to the general welfare. This wise and beneficial system he represents as due to Romulus; to whose foundation are likewise referred the ample provisions made for the performance of sacerdotal functions and the service of the gods. Dionysius particularly adverts to the corporate rites of the curiæ, and their simple banquets, which were preserved until his time in their primitive and unadorned style.(25) He adds that Numa, and some of the subsequent kings, developed and increased the religious institutions created by Romulus; but that the basis of the entire system was laid by the founder of the state.(26) The institution of the Vestal virgins was attributed by some writers to Romulus, though others gave it to Numa. In either case it must, consistently with the story of Rhea Silvia, be supposed to have been continued or transferred from Alba.(27)

---

(23) According to Livy, i. 11, the mild treatment of Antemnæ, and its admission to the rights of Roman citizenship, is due to the influence of Hersilia, the wife of Romulus, who intercedes in their behalf.

(24) Dion. Hal. ii. 16-7.

(25) Dion. Hal. ii. 18—23. He says of the sacrifices instituted by Romulus, *ὧν αἱ πλεῖσται διέμενον ἕως τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡλικίας, εἰ καὶ μὴ πᾶσαι, κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον ἐπιτελούμεναι τρόπον*; c. 23.

(26) Ib. c. 23. The remarks of Dionysius in c. 19, upon the immoral Greek legends concerning the gods, are similar to those in the Republic of

Romulus is further presented to us as making wise ordinances not only for constitutional and public law, but also for private and domestic relations. Of these ordinances, some were in writing, but the majority were mere unwritten rules, which afterwards became legal usages.(28) Dionysius describes him as recognising the truth, that no state can enjoy tranquillity unless the private lives of its citizens are well regulated. The marriage law of the Romans, and their law concerning *patria potestas*, are referred to his institution, and favourably compared with the corresponding laws of the Greeks. No marriage, says Dionysius, was dissolved at Rome until the year 523 U.C. (231 B.C.), when Spurius Carvilius was compelled by the censors to divorce his wife on account of her barrenness.(29) Plutarch likewise considers it as

---

Plato, and in other Greek philosophers. See Grote, vol. i. p. 557—90. The classes of Greek legends which Dionysius excepts from his censure are: 1, those that explain operations of nature in allegories; 2, those which afford consolation in misfortune; 3, those which remove fears and mental perturbations, and purge the mind of unsound opinions; c. 20. Polybius, vi. 56, likewise speaks with high praise of the attention paid by the Romans to religion, which he considers as an imposture contrived by wise men for restraining the evil passions of the multitude. *εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν πολίτευμα συναγαγεῖν* (he says), *ἴσως οὐδὲν ἦν ἀναγκαῖος ὁ τοιοῦτος τρόπος*. Compare Strabo, i. 2, § 8. Polybius speaks of the excellent moral effects of the religious system of the Romans, compared with the neglect of religion among the Greeks. Lucretius, however, in deploring the evil effects of religion, makes no exception in favour of his own country.

(27) Plut. Rom. 22; Num. 9. 10; Camill. 20. Tarpeia is a Vestal virgin in Propert. iv. 4; Varro, L. L. v. 41. Livy, i. 20, ascribes their foundation to Numa: 'Virgines Vestæ legit, Albâ oriundum sacerdotium, et genti conditoris haud alienum.' Dionysius, ii. 65, considers the point as to the institution of Vestals doubtful: he believes that Romulus made a provision for the worship of Vesta, but abstained from establishing any virgin priestesses of the goddess, because, if any one of them broke her vow of chastity, he would not, from the recollection of his mother, have been able to inflict upon her the proper punishment. The prevailing idea was that Numa, as the principal religious founder, instituted the Vestal virgins. See Schwegler, ib. p. 544, n. 1.

(28) Dion. Hal. ii. 24. He afterwards speaks of the *ἐθισμοί τε καὶ νόμοι* of Romulus, which were handed down to Numa: ii. 63.

(29) Different dates for the first divorce are given by other authors, but the difference amounts only to a few years: see Fischer, ad Ann. 523, p. 82.

a peculiarity of the legislation of Romulus that there was no special punishment for parricide; experience, however, he remarks, proved that the lawgiver was right, for no parricide was committed at Rome for nearly 600 years; L. Hostius, after the Second Punic War, having been the first who is reported to have been guilty of this crime.(30) Romulus, moreover, looking to the discipline of the mind and body, interdicted the citizens from all mechanical and sedentary arts, which he left to foreigners and slaves, and confined them to agriculture and military pursuits. Hence, instead of leaving the country to be cultivated by serfs, and collecting the citizens into the town, like the Lacedæmonians, he caused the citizens to till the land during peace, coming into the town every ninth day (on the nundinæ) for their market; and to serve as soldiers during war.(31) As, however, in other ancient customs, different origins were assigned for the nundinæ: some ascribed its institution to Servius Tullius, while others said that it began in the memorial rites offered by the plebeians to the soul of the same king.(32)

---

(30) Plut. Rom. 22. Nothing seems to be known of this L. Hostius. Dion. Hal. iv. 62, speaks of a certain M. Atilius, who was punished for parricide by Tarquinius Superbus; he was sewn up in a bull's hide and thrown into the sea. Compare Rein, Criminalrecht der Römer, p. 401, 453. The law imposing this peculiar punishment on parricides was doubtless very ancient. See Scriptor ad Herenn. i. 13: Et lex, qui parentem necasse judicatus erit, ut is obvolutus et obligatus corio, devehatur in profluentem. Compare the remark above, on the long abstinence from sanguinary civil conflicts.

(31) Dion. Hal. ii. 28; cf. vii. 58. The early Romans were what the Greeks called *αὐτουργοί*; that is to say, they resided on their own land, and cultivated it by their own labour, and that of their sons, without resorting to the use of slaves. Compare the verses of Euripides, Orest. 917—20.

ἄλλος δ' ἀναστὰς ἔλεγε τῷδ' ἐναντία,
μορφῇ μὲν οὐκ εὐωπός, ἀνδρεῖος δ' ἀνήρ,
ὀλιγάκις ἄστυ κἀγορᾶς χραίνων κύκλον,
αὐτουργός, οἵπερ καὶ μόνοι σῴζουσι γῆν.

This state of things was generally considered advantageous. Thucydides, however, reckons it a disadvantage of the Peloponnesians for military purposes that they are *αὐτουργοί*; i. 141. Compare Xen. Oecon. 5, § 4, for the meaning of the word. Concerning the *αὐτουργία* of the early Romans, see Dion. Hal. ix. 10, 27; x. 17, 19, 48; Plut. Cat. Maj. 2.

(32) Harum originem quidam Romulo assignant, quem communicato regno cum T. Tatio, sacrificiis et sodalitatibus institutis, nundinas quoque adjecisse commemorant; sicut Tuditanus affirmat. Sed Cassius Servium

§ 2 Such are the general measures of legislation and political organization which are ascribed to Romulus. He is further said to have commenced his reign by taking steps for increasing the numbers of his new settlement. He made an ordinance compelling every man to rear all the male children, and the first-born of the female; and he prohibited the killing of infants, unless they were imperfectly formed.(33) He likewise opened an asylum for refugees from foreign states; the place of which, on the Capitoline hill, was shown in later times.(34) The original colonists from Alba are stated by Dionysius to have been 3000 footmen and 300 horsemen; by Plutarch to have consisted only of 1000 families.(35)

The reception of refugees in the asylum (like the transportation of convicts to Australia in our own time) disturbs the natural proportion of the two sexes, and produces a community in which the men preponderate.(36) Hence Romulus sends round envoys to

---

Tullium fecisse nundinas dicit, ut in urbem ex agris convenirent, urbanas rusticasque res ordinaturi. Geminus ait diem nundinarum exactis jam regibus cœpisse celebrari; quia plerique de plebe, repetitâ Servii Tullii memoriâ, parentarent ei in nundinis, cui rei etiam Varro consentit; Macrob. Sat. i. 16. In this passage, Sempronius Tuditanus (Krause, p. 178) and Tanusius Geminus seem to be meant. Concerning Cassius, see Krause, p. 167, n.

(33) Dion. Hal. ii. 15.

(34) Dion. Hal. ib.; Plut. Rom. 9; Livy, i. 8, cf. ii. 1. Dionysius, desirous of ennobling the origin of Rome, represents the asylum as destined for the reception of political refugees, driven from home by the oppression of despots or oligarchs: Livy however is less tender of the early reputation of his country: 'Eo ex finitimis populis turba omnis sine discrimine, *liber an servus esset*, avida novarum rerum perfugit;' i. 8; also Strabo, v. 3, § 2, to the same effect; and Ovid, Fast. iii. 429—34. Livy rationalizes the term *γηγενεῖς*, applied to the primitive population of certain states, by referring it to their obscure and lowly origin: 'Vetere consilio condentium urbes, qui, obscuram atque humilem conciendo ad se multitudinem, natam e terrâ sibi prolem ementiebantur.' Thucydides in like manner rationalizes the belief of the Athenians in their being *αὐτόχθονες*, by saying that the barrenness of the soil of Attica rendered the country unattractive to strangers, and thus caused the population to be stationary; i. 2. Compare Harpocrat. in *αὐτόχθονες*. Concerning the supposed locality of the Asylum —*inter duos lucos*—see Becker, vol. i. p. 410; and generally, Schwegler, i. 1. p. 459, 464. Above, p. 267.

(35) Dion. Hal. i. 87; ii. 2; Plut. Rom. 9.

(36) Jam res Romana adeo erat valida, ut cuilibet finitimarum civitatum bello par esset; sed, penuriâ mulierum, hominis ætatem duratura magnitudo erat, quippe quibus nec domi spes prolis, nec cum finitimis connubia essent; Livy, i. 9.

the neighbouring cities, inviting them to give their daughters in marriage to the Romans. His proposals are rejected, and he accordingly resorts to stratagem for effecting his purpose. He institutes a festival called Consualia (which continued to be celebrated in later times), (37) and invites the neighbouring people to the amusement. On a signal given by himself, the unmarried women are seized, and detained as wives for the Romans.(38) Other causes were found for the rape of the Sabine women; some considered it as an intentional provocative to war, and some thought that it was intended to bring about a reciprocity of marriages with the neighbouring states.(39) According to Fabius Pictor, the event occurred in the fourth month after the foundation of the city. Others assigned it generally to the first year of the reign of Romulus; but Cnæus Gellius, the historian, who lived at the time of the Gracchi, placed it in the fourth year.(40) There were also different accounts of the number of the ravished women: one fixed it at thirty, and made them the eponyms of the thirty curiæ; when this small number was in the legend, the motive of increasing the population had not been invented; afterwards, the numbers of 527, or 683, or 800, were selected, in order to agree better with the circumstances of the story.(41) Hersilia—who, according to some accounts, was the wife of Romulus, and, according to others, of Hostilius, the grandfather of king Tullus Hostilius—is reported to have been among these Sabine women.(42) Certain ceremonies of the Roman marriage—which supposed the bride to be taken against her will to her husband's house—and particularly the cry of *Talassio*, which was customary on that occasion—were derived from the Rape of the Sabines.(43)

---

(37) *τὴν δὲ τότε τῷ Ῥωμύλῳ καθιερωθεῖσαν ἑορτὴν ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἄγοντες Ῥωμαῖοι διετέλουν, Κωνσουάλια καλοῦντες*; Dion. Hal. ii. 31. Dionysius however had, in a former place, attributed the origin of this festival to Evander and the Arcadians, i. 33; above, p. 288 n. 68. Cic. Rep. ii. 7; Livy, i. 9, and Ovid, Fast. iii. 199, ascribe the institution of the Consualia to Romulus. Compare Schwegler, i. 1, p. 471—6.

(38) Dion. Hal. ii. 30-1; Livy, i. 9; Plut. Rom. 14-5; Cic. Rep. ii. 7; Virg. Æn. viii. 635; Ovid, Fast. iii. 179—200; De Art. Am. i. 101—30. Compare Schwegler, i. 1, p. 460—468. Livy gives the terms of the message of Romulus to the cities, their answers, and the words which he used in order to calm the anger of the ravished virgins. The latter conclude with the following passage: 'Sæpe ex injuriâ postmodum gratiam ortam; eoque melioribus usuras viris, quod adnisurus pro se quisque sit, ut, quum suam vicem functus officio sit, parentum etiam patriæque expleat desiderium.' The last words recal the sentiment beautifully expressed by Propertius:

> 'Fungere maternis vicibus, pater; illa meorum
> Omnis erit collo turba ferenda tuo.
> Oscula cum dederis tua flentibus, adjice matris.
> Tota domus cœpit nunc onus esse tuum.'—iv. 11, 75-8.

(39) According to Dion. Hal. ii. 31, the advocates of the latter opinion are *οἱ τὰ πιθανώτατα γράφοντες*. Livy, ii. 18, mentions a disturbance having arisen at Rome, in one of the first years of the Republic, (501 B.C.) from a similar act of the Sabine youth. 'Eo anno Romæ, quum per ludos ab Sabinorum juventute per lasciviam scorta raperentur, concursu hominum rixa ac prope prælium fuit; parvâque ex re ad rebellionem spectare res videbatur.'

(40) Plut. Rom. 14; Dion. Hal. ii. 31. Concerning Cn. Gellius, see Krause, p. 202.

§ 3 The outrage thus committed by the Romans roused the anger of the neighbouring cities, and particularly of Cænina, Antemnæ, and Crustumerium, which prepared to attack Rome, and attempted to induce the more powerful Sabine nation to join in the war.(44) Romulus speedily marched against the people of Cænina: he defeated them, killed their king Acron with his own hand, and stripped off his arms, which he dedicated as spolia opima in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius.(45) Hence arose the custom, when the Roman general slew the hostile general, of dedicating his spoils in this temple. The event, however, happened only twice in Roman history after the deed of Romulus; viz., once when Cornelius Cossus slew the Veientine king Tolumnius, and again when Marcellus slew a king of the Gauls.(46) Romulus then turned his arms against Antemnæ; and having reduced this town, he returned with the spoil to Rome, his army preceding him in a triumphal procession; and this was the origin of the Roman Triumph, so celebrated in later times.(47) Romulus made these towns Roman colonies, by sending three hundred Roman colonists into each, and confiscating one-third of the land for their use; while he removed three thousand of their citizens to Rome, and included them in the tribes and curiæ.(48) Similar measures were adopted towards Crustumerium.(49)

---

(41) Livy, i. 13, who says that the curiæ were named after the Sabine women, thinks that a selection must have been made, either according to their age or rank, or by lot. Plut. Num. 14. Valerias Antias fixed the number at 527; Juba at 683, which is the number adopted by Dionysius, ii. 30. The number of 'nearly 800' is given by Plut. Comp. Thes. et Rom. 6; but it appears to be an error of memory for 'nearly 700,' and to allude to the number 683.

(42) Plut. Rom. 14—18; Livy, i. 11; Ovid, Met. xiv. 829-51. Dionysius, ii. 45, makes Hersilia the leader of the Sabine women, who go as ambassadors to their countrymen. Compare Plut. Rom. 19; Serv. ad Æn. viii. 638. Other passages are collected by Schwegler, i. 1, p, 478.

(43) See Livy, i. 9; Plut. Rom. 15; Victor de Vir. Ill. c. 2; Serv. Æn. i. 651. As in other instances, however, the explanations of the name Talassius or Talassio were fluctuating and discordant. See this point well explained in Schwegler, p. 470.

(44) Dionysius thinks that the Rape of the Sabines was a mere pretext, and that the jealousy of these towns at the growing greatness of Rome was the real cause of the war; ii. 32. This is an imitation of Thucydides, who believes that the power of Agamemnon, and not the rape of Helen, is the cause of the Trojan war; i. 9. The passage of Dion. Hal. ii. 32-3, and a part of 34 is repeated in an excerpt of Nicolaus Damascenus, Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iii. p. 411.

§ 4 In consequence of these successes of Romulus, some towns voluntarily constituted themselves Roman colonies, and Cælius, an Etruscan general, came with his army to Rome, where he settled on the Cælian hill, thus called after his name. Both the name and the time of this Etruscan auxiliary are fluctuating and unfixed.(50) The Sabines, however, being a powerful nation, resolve to avenge the injury done them, and prepare for war. They assemble at Cures, and elect Titus Tatius, king of Cures, as the federal general.(51) Romulus, on the other hand, fortifies the heights of Rome; and he is joined by an Etruscan leader, named Lucumo, who is by some writers distinguished from Cælius, and by others confounded with him.(52) With this reinforcement, the army of Romulus consists of 20,000 foot and 800 horse; opposed to a force of 25,000 foot and nearly 1000 horse.(53) Tatius marches to Rome, and finds everything ready for his reception. Being baffled in his attempt to surprise the town, he gladly avails himself of a treasonable offer to open the gate of the Capitol to him, and then follows the well-known story of Tarpeia. This incident appears to have been narrated in detail by Fabius Pictor, and Cincius, the two earliest historians; they agreed in describing Tarpēia as a traitress, who bargained for the golden bracelets which the Sabine soldiers bore on their left arms, and was fatally deceived by an evasive interpretation of the compact, true to its letter, but false to its intention.(54) L. Piso, however, desirous of saving the honour of Tarpeia, gave a different version of the story. He represented her as wishing to deceive the Sabines, and as bargaining for their shields; but the messenger whom she sends to Romulus betrays her, and reveals her intention to Tatius. Both accounts however described her as having died on this occasion, and as having been buried on the Capitol, near the rock which bore her name; and even in the Augustan age, annual rites were performed at her tomb.(55) Other local legends were likewise connected with Tarpeia and the Sabine war. Thus a door under the Capitol, called the *Porta Pandana*, which was always kept open, was referred to this event;(56) a hot spring, moreover, near the temple of Janus, was said to have been thrown up by the god Janus in order to stop the Sabines, and save the Romans from the treachery of Tarpeia.(57) Even with respect to this celebrated event, the voice of legend was not consistent; for Simylus, a Greek elegiac poet, described Tarpeia as having betrayed the Capitol to a king of the Gauls, of whom she was enamoured.(58)

---

(45) Dion. Hal. ii. 33-4; Livy, i. 10; Plut. Rom. 16. The elegy of Propert. iv. 10, is an *αἴτιον* of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, similar to those in Ovid's Fasti. Compare Schwegler, p. 461. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 229, says that the Greek name of Acron 'is a proof how late Pelasgian recollections were retained in the legends.' There is, however, no evidence that the name is derived from an ancient tradition; it may have been introduced from some late Grecian source. The enlargement of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius by Ancus Marcius is mentioned in Livy, i. 33.

(46) See Livy, ii. 20; Epit. xx.; Plut. Marcell. 8; Virg. Æn. vi. 856—60, cum Serv. Festus, in opima spolia, p. 186.

(47) Dion. Hal. ii. 34, who says that Romulus was conveyed in a chariot drawn by four horses. Plutarch, Rom. 16, corrects him, remarking that either Tarquin the elder, or Publicola, first introduced this practice, and that all the triumphal statues of Romulus represent him on foot.

(48) Ib. c. 35.

(49) Ib. 35; Livy, i. 11; Plut. Rom. 17.

(50) See below, § 31.

---

(51) The stories respecting the origin of the Sabine nation, and of their town Cures, are narrated by Dion. Hal. ii. 48-9, and are of the same fabulous character as other foundation legends.

(52) Dion. Hal. ii. 37, 42, 43, and Cic. de Rep. ii. 8, distinguish between Cælius and Lucumo. Varro, L. L. v. 46, identifies them. Propertius seems to agree with Dionysius and Cicero in making Lucumo the auxiliary of Romulus against the Sabines. In one place he is called Lucmo, in another Lucomedius:

> Prima galeritus posuit tentoria Lucmo.—iv. 1, 29.
> Et tu, Roma, meis tribuisti præmia Tuscis,
>   Unde hodie vicus nomina Tuscus habet.
> Tempore quo sociis venit Lucomedius armis,
>   Atque Sabina feri contudit arma Tati.—iv. 2, 49—52.

(53) Dion. Hal. ii. 37.

(54) καὶ αὐτήν, ὡς μὲν Φάβιός τε καὶ Κίγκιος γράφουσιν, ἔρως εἰσέρχεται τῶν ψαλίων, &c.; Dion. Hal. ii. 38. After describing the bargain with Tatius, Dionysius continues: μέχρι μὲν δὴ τούτων συμφέρονται πάντες οἱ Ῥωμαίων συγγραφεῖς, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ὕστερον λεγομένοις οὐχ ὁμολογοῦσι. He then introduces the variation of Piso, and adds: οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Φάβιόν τε καὶ Κίγκιον οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον λέγουσι γεγονέναι—τὰ δ' ἑξῆς ἅπαντες πάλιν ὁμοίως γράφουσι; c. 39. Ovid, Fast. i. 261, adopts the common story that she betrayed her country for the sake of the Sabine armlets. Festus, in Tarpeiæ, p. 363, speaks of the agreement, but not of its breach. He adds that Tatius stipulated that the gate through which the Sabines had been admitted by Tarpeia, should always be open to them. This alludes to the Porta Pandana.

---

(55) Dion. Hal. ii. 38—40; Livy, i. 11; Varro, de L. L. v. 41. According to Plut. Rom. 18, the remains of Tarpeia were transported elsewhere, when Tarquin dedicated the Capitol to Jupiter. Dionysius thinks that the honours paid to the memory of Tarpeia are a proof that Piso's is the true story; for if she had really been a traitress, her body would have been cast out unburied, as an example to all who might desire to betray their country. This version is likewise alluded to by Livy, ib. 'Sunt qui eam ex pacto tradendi quod in sinistris manibus esset, directo arma petisse dicant; et fraude visam agere, suâ ipsam peremptam mercede.' Propertius, iv. 4, represents Tarpeia as a traitress, who is in love with Tatius, and stipulates for his hand as the reward of her treason. He gives a different turn to the conclusion of the story.

> 'Prodiderat portæque fidem, patriamque jacentem;
> Nubendique petit, quem velit ipsa, diem.
> At Tatius (neque enim sceleri dedit hostis honorem)
> Nube, ait, et regni scande cubile mei.
> Dixit, et ingestis comitum superobruit armis,
> Hæc, virgo, officiis dos erat apta tuis.
> A duce Tarpeio mons est cognomen adeptus.
> O vigil, injustæ præmia sortis habes.'—v. 89—94.

This termination agrees with the verses of Simylus in Plut. Rom. 17. Spurius Tarpeius is described as the commander of the Capitol, and the father of Tarpeia, in Livy, i. 11. Plutarch, Rom. 17, adopts this account, and rejects the idea of some, that Tarpeia herself had the charge of the Capitol, a supposition (says Plutarch) which would represent Romulus as destitute of common sense: ὡς ἔνιοι λέγουσιν εὐήθη τὸν Ῥωμύλον ἀποδεικνύοντες. We may compare with this the remark of Herodotus upon the Trojan legend of Helen; which he rejects because he thinks that Priam and his kinsmen would have been insane if they had allowed the siege of Troy to last for ten years, provided they could at any moment have put an end to it by the surrender of Helen; ii. 120. According to Juba, Sulpicius Galba related that Tarpeius was prosecuted by Romulus for treachery, Plut. Rom. 17. This Sulpicius Galba seems to be the grandfather of the Emperor Galba, who, according to Suet. Galb. 3, multiplicem nec incuriosam historiam edidit. His lifetime would have preceded that of Juba. Another, wholly different, story was that Tarpeia was the daughter of Tatius, and having been ravished by Romulus, was put to death by her father. This version was adopted by Antigonus, who was prior to Polybius: Plut. Rom. 17. See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 305.

Clitophon, in his Γαλατικὰ, told a story of Brennus, a Gallic king, persuading Demonice, a woman of Ephesus, to betray the town to him, on condition of her receiving the ornaments and necklaces of the women: whereupon, his soldiers overwhelm her with gold. Stob. Flor. x. 71; Plut.

Although the treachery of Tarpeia gives to the Sabines the possession of the Capitol, it produces no decisive result. Conflicts ensue between the hostile armies, in one of which Mettus Curtius, who is variously represented as a Roman and as a Sabine, is with difficulty extricated from a marsh, which received from him the name of *Lacus Curtius*. Its place was afterwards pointed out in the Forum.(59) The origin of the

---

Parall. c. 15; Frag. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 367. The occasion referred to must be that of the conquest of Asia Minor by the Gauls in 278 B.C. See Livy, xxxviii. 16. The Capitoline was supposed to have been originally called the Tarpeian hill; Plut. Rom. 18; Num. 7. Above, p. 288, n. 71.

(56) Festus, p. 220, 363, and other passages cited by Becker, vol. i. p. 119; Schwegler, ib. p. 487. The door seems to have been in some inaccessible rock—though Herdonius is described by Dionysius, x. 14, as penetrating through this door into the Capitol. Polyænus, viii. 25, refers the open door of the Capitol to the Gallic invasion. A similar confusion between the taking of the Capitol by the Sabines, and the capture of the city by the Gauls, occurs in the verses of Simylus, below, n. 58, and in the legends of the Nonæ Caprotinæ, below, p. 430.

(57) See Ovid, Fast. i. 259-74; Met. xiv. 778-99; Macrob. Sat. i. 9; Serv. Æn. i. 295, viii. 361. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 348-52, who remarks that this legend of the hot spring differs from the received story, in supposing that the treachery of Tarpeia is unsuccessful, and that the Sabines do not penetrate into the Capitol. Such inconsistencies are, however, of perpetual occurrence in legendary history.

(58) Plut. Rom. 17. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 230, believes that he recovered at Rome a genuine popular legend concerning Tarpeia, which, as he says, had been preserved for twenty-five centuries in the mouth of the common people. It would be desirable that the existence of this popular legend should be verified by some native antiquary, who would be more likely to guard against deceit than a foreigner. All experience contradicts the preservation of oral tradition for anything like the time mentioned by Niebuhr. See above p. 98, n. 3.

(59) Dion. Hal. ii. 42. says that he commanded the centre of the Roman army. He is a Sabine leader, according to Livy, i. 13: Plut. Rom. 18; Piso, ap. Varr. de L. L. v. 149. See Becker, vol. i. p. 283, 319.

name was however more generally referred to M. Curtius, who was related to have leaped, armed, and on horseback, into a chasm in the Forum, in the year 362 B.C., nearly four centuries after the time assigned to Romulus.(60) It is further related, that when the Roman army was on the point of giving way, Romulus arrested its flight by vowing a temple to Jupiter; which was afterwards known by the name of the temple of Jupiter Stator.(61)

§ 5 While the conflict is still undecided, an unexpected event brings about a reconciliation between the two nations. The Sabine women who have become Roman matrons interpose between the combatants, and prevail upon them to put an end to the war. According to the more poetical and probably more ancient form of the story, they throw themselves between the hostile ranks, and implore their fathers on the one side, their husbands on the other, to sheath their swords:(62) according to another, and probably a rationalized version, they go in a body to the Sabine camp, on a mission of peace, with Hersilia at their head, as their organ.(63) Hereupon, a formal treaty is made between the two nations, by which it is agreed that Romulus and Tatius shall be joint kings of the Roman people, with equal powers and honours; that Rome shall retain its name, and that each citizen shall be called a Roman, but that the community, as a whole, shall be called Quirites, from the Sabine town of Cures; and that the Sabines shall be incorporated in the state, and admitted into the tribes and curiæ.(64) According to some, the place where this treaty was concluded received the name of *Comitium;* a name which it retained in later times.(65) According to others, the holy compact was ratified upon the Sacra Via.(66) Three of the principal Sabines, Valerius Volesus, Tullus Tyrannus, and Mettus Curtius, remained at Rome with Tatius, and received honours, which were enjoyed by their descendants.(67)

---

(60) See Varr. de L. L. v. 148; Livy, vii. 6; Dion. Hal. xiv. 20-1; Dio Cass. 30, vol. i. p. 26, ed. Bekker. Livy, after reporting the belief 'lacum Curtium non ab antiquo illo T. Tatii milite Curtio Metto, sed ab hoc appellatum,' proceeds to make the following remark, which deserves the attention of all who attempt to construct a historical narrative out of legendary materials. 'Cura non deesset, si qua ad verum via inquirentem ferret; nunc famâ rerum standum est, ubi certam derogat vetustas fidem, et lacûs nomen ab hac recentiore insignitius fabulâ est.' Schwegler, p. 484, n. 2, thinks that the story of Mettus Curtius is a prosaic and rationalized substitution for the more marvellous legend of M. Curtius leaping into the chasm: but the probability is that, as in so many other cases, they are merely independent stories invented as explanations of a local name, the true origin of which was unknown. Another explanation is reported by Varro, L. L. v. 150, viz., that the name was derived from C. Curtius Philo, who was consul with M. Genucius, in 309 U.C. (445 B.C.), because the place, having been struck with lightning, was fenced in during his consulship. The latter explanation has nothing marvellous; but we do not know whether it was sufficiently attested. See Ovid, Fast. vi. 397.

(61) Dion. Hal. ii. 50; Livy. i. 12; Plut. Rom. 18; Ovid, Fast. vi. 785. Tac. Ann. xv. 41. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 463, n. 8. On the situation of the temple of Jupiter Stator, see Becker, vol. i. p. 112.

(62) Livy, i. 13; Plut. Rom. 19; Dio Cass. 5, vol. i. p. 6; Ovid, Fast. iii. 203—28.

(63) Dion. Hal. ii. 44-6. Cn Gellius the historian, Krause, p. 201; Appian, Rom. Hist. i. 4. The expressions of Cicero, Rep. ii. 7 and 8, are

---

ambiguous, but appear to imply a formal embassy. The very words which the Sabine women addressed to the combatants are given by Livy. Plutarch and Dio also report the speech of Hersilia in the same situation. Dionysius says that the women *τυχοῦσαι λόγου μακρὰς ἐξέτεινον διηγήσεις*, c. 45; but he does not detail them in his text. A speech of Hersilia to Tatius was in the history of Gellius, a fragment of which is preserved. Dionysius mentions that, according to some historians, Hersilia was one of the Sabine women who had made a forced marriage: he adds, however, that the more probable version (*οἱ τὰ πιθανώτατα γράφοντες*) represented her as having stayed voluntarily with a single daughter, who was one of the ravished women, c. 45. Compare Schwegler, p. 463. The number thirty was sometimes transferred from the ravished women to the envoys; Dion. Hal. ii. 47. Varro gave the same number for the envoys as Valerius Antias for the ravished women, viz. 527. Dion. Hal. ib. The words of Cicero, Rep. ii. 8, are ambiguous.

(64) Dion. Hal. ii. 46; Livy, i. 13; Plut. Rom. 19; Virg. Æn. viii. 639-41. In all the curiæ there were tables sacred to Juno Quiritia, which had been instituted by Tatius, and remained to the time of Dionysius; ii. 50. A different account of the terms on which the Sabines were incorporated is given by Servius, Æn. vii. 709: Post Sabinarum raptum, et factum inter Romulum et Titum Tatium fœdus, recepti in urbem Sabini sunt; sed hâc lege ut in omnibus essent cives Romani, exceptâ suffragii latione; nam magistratus non creabant. This statement has, from its precision, an appearance of being founded on authentic testimony; but the appearance is delusive, for, as is proved by numerous examples, fiction may be as precise, and as full of minute details, as truth.

(65) Plut. Rom. 19. See Becker, vol. i. p. 273.

(66) Dion. Hal. ii. 46; Festus, p. 290. Servius, Æn. viii. 641, says there were statues commemorative of this treaty on the Sacra Via; that of Romulus towards the Palatium, that of Tatius towards the Rostra. See Becker, vol. i. p. 219.

(67) Dion. Hal. ii. 46.

The debt which Rome owed to the Sabine women was supposed to be commemorated by various ancient customs. Thus the festival of Matronalia was believed to have been instituted by Romulus on this occasion:(68) the names of the curiæ were traced to the thirty envoys to Tatius;(69) and various privileges of the Roman matron were reported to have been granted as rewards which the women had earned by this patriotic act.(70)

§ 6 Two new hills are now added to the city, the Cælian and the Quirinal. The two kings had concurrent power, but they divided their jurisdiction; that of Romulus extending over the Palatine and Cælian hills, that of Tatius over the Capitol and the Quirinal.(71) The place of common meeting was the Forum, which lay between their respective territories, and retained its name and place in later times;(72) but they also deliberated separately, each with his hundred senators.(73) Their joint rule continued harmoniously for five years: when it was terminated by the death of Tatius, who was killed out of revenge by some inhabitants of Lavinium. He received an honourable burial, and in later times public rites were performed in memory of him.(74) Some prodigies occurred at Rome, marking the displeasure of the gods at the murder of ambassadors from Lavinium, who were involved in the affair of Tatius. This guilt was expiated, at the direction of Romulus, by rites which were in aftertimes continued at the Ferentine grove.(75)

---

(68) Plut. Rom. 21; Fast. iii. 167—230.

(69) Varro disputed this derivation of the names of the curiæ, saying that they had been imposed by Romulus before the Sabine war, and that some were taken from military leaders, and others from other origins (the words τὰ δ' ἀπὸ πάντων are corrupt): Dion. Hal. ii. 47. Plutarch, Rom. 20, remarks that the curiæ could not have been named after the Sabine women, for that many are names of places. Concerning the names of the curiæ, see Becker, vol. ii. 1, p. 32.

(70) Plut. Rom. 15, 19, 20. Compare Schwegler, p. 464.

(71) According to Varro, ap. Serv. Æn. vii. 657, the Sabines, when incorporated by Romulus, settled on the Aventine hill. See above, p. 366, note 40. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 117.

(72) Dion. Hal. ii. 50. Tacitus, Ann. xii. 24, speaks of the Forum and Capitol having been added to the city by Tatius, not by Romulus.

(73) Plut. Rom. 20.

(74) Dion. Hal. ii. 51-2. who says that Licinius Macer differed from the other historians as to some of the details of the death of Tatius: see Krause, p. 238; Livy, i. 14; Plut. Rom. 23. The tomb of Tatius was shown near the Armilustrium on the Aventine, according to Plutarch; ib. He was also said to have been buried at a place called Lauretum on the Aventine, and the name of the place was derived from the Laurentians, the murderers of Tatius; Varro, de L. L. v. 152. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 450.

§ 7 Romulus, now become again sole king, undertakes some wars against neighbouring towns; he reduces Fidenæ to the state of a Roman colony;(76) and he punishes Cameria, which had already been made a colony in the joint reign with Tatius, for its defection.(77) According to Dionysius, he dedicated a brazen quadriga, from the spoils of this town, to Vulcan, and placed his own statue by its side, with an inscription, in Greek characters, recording his exploits. He likewise defeats the Veientes, and compels them to cede a tract of land near the Tiber, called the *Septem pagi*, and the salt-works at the mouth of the Tiber. A treaty is made with them for 100 years, which was engraved upon a column. The number of Veientes who fell in this battle was 14,000; of whom above half were killed by the hand of Romulus himself.(78)

§ 8 The military successes of Romulus are however cut short by his death. Respecting this event, there were different accounts. One was quite marvellous, and represented him, while haranguing his soldiers, as surprised by a sudden darkness, and tempest, in the midst of which he disappeared, having been taken up to heaven by his father, Mars.(79) Another account was, that having changed his mode of governing, and adopted the severe rule of a despot instead of the mild rule of a king,(80) he became the object of hatred to the senators, who murdered him, and tore him limb from limb, and secreted his mangled remains under their garments. There was likewise a third account, that he was killed, during an eclipse, by the newly incorporated citizens; the sudden and supernatural darkness, having caused the people to fly from the Forum, and to leave Romulus alone. The memory of this circumstance was preserved by the festival Populifugia, which was still celebrated at the time of Dionysius.(81) Other explanations were however given for this festival: it was said to allude to a flight of the Romans from an attack made upon them soon after the Gallic capture of the city,(82) and also to a defeat received on some occasion from the Etruscans.(83) This fluctuation of the legend proves, as in other cases, that the true origin of the festival was forgotten, and that all the explanations were equally fictitious. The same festival was likewise called *Nonæ Caprotinæ*, and this appellation was derived from the name of the place (Capræ palus) where Romulus was supposed to have been taken up into heaven.(84)

---

(75) Plut. Rom. 24; cf. Dion. Hal. ii. 53-54. The text of Plutarch has *ἐπὶ τῆς Φερεντίνης πύλης*, for which ὕλης or πήγης has been corrected: see Becker, vol. i. p. 170; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 522.

(76) Dion. Hal. ii. 53; Livy, i. 14; Plut. Rom. 23.

(77) Dion. Hal. ii. 50—54; Plut. Rom. 24. Livy does not mention Cameria in the reign of Romulus. He places its capture in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus; i. 38.

(78) Dion. Hal. ii. 54-5; Livy, i. 15; Plut. Rom. 25. According to Livy, i. 23, the Salinæ near Ostia were made in the reign of Ancus Marcius. Plutarch says that Romulus triumphed over the Veientes on the Ides of October, and that the Veientine general was led in his triumph, an old man, but without the wisdom of age. In memory of this circumstance, a custom prevailed in later times, of leading an old man through the Forum to the Capitol, in a prætexta, and a child's bulla tied round his neck; the herald crying out, *Sardi venales*. Plutarch connects this saying with the supposed occasion, by explaining that Veii was an Etruscan city, and that the Etruscans came from Sardes in Lydia. Another, and more probable explanation of this proverb, is that it arose from the large number of captives brought from Sardinia by Tib. Sempronius Gracchus, when he conquered the island in 238 B.C.; Victor de Vir. Illustr. 57. Compare Festus, in Sardi Venales, p. 322 (a part of the article is mutilated).

---

(79) Dion. Hal. ii. 56; Livy, i. 16; Plut. Rom. 27-8; Ovid, Fast. ii. 485—510; Cic. Rep. ii. 10. This account was confirmed by the testimony of Proculus Julius, to whom Romulus appeared in a divine form, and predicted the future greatness of Rome; Livy, i. 16: Plut. Rom. 28; Dion. Hal ii. 63; Cic. ib.

Livia gave a large reward to Numerius Atticus, a senator, who said that he had seen Augustus ascending to heaven, in the same manner, says Dio Cassius, as Romulus had been seen by Proculus; lvi. 46.

Dionysius, ii. 56, remarks upon the extraordinary fact that both the conception of Romulus, and his translation to heaven, were accompanied by an eclipse of the sun. Cicero, Rep. i. 16, says that the eclipses in the early Roman history had been calculated backwards up to the eclipse on the Nones of Quinctilis, when Romulus was taken up into heaven. Those who made this calculation must have considered the latter eclipse as a real event. Compare above, p. 159, n. 92.

(80) *μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι βαρὺς ἤδη καὶ αὐθάδης εἶναι ἐδόκει, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκέτι βασιλικῶς ἀλλὰ τυραννικώτερον ἐξάγειν.* Dion. Hal. ii. 56. See also Plut. Rom. 26-27; Num. 2. Compare Schwegler, ib. 517, 535. The restoration of the Veientine hostages without the consent of the Senate, and on his own authority, is particularly specified as an act which gave offence; Dio Cass. v. 11 (vol. i. p. 7. ed. Bekker;) Plut. Rom. 27. Dio Cassius assures us that Romulus went so far as to tell the senators that he had appointed them, not in order that they should control him, but that he might command them: *καὶ τέλος εἶπεν ὅτι ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς, ὦ πατέρες, ἐξελεξάμην οὐχ ἵνα ὑμεῖς ἐμοὶ ἄρχητε, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ἐπιτάττοιμι.*

(81) Dion. Hal. ii. 56; Plut. Rom. 27; Livy, i. 16. Dionysius calls the first account fabulous, and the second one probable. Livy seems to incline to the same version; but he allows the former to be the prevalent story: 'Fuisse credo tum quoque aliquos, qui discerptum regem Patrum manibus taciti arguerent: manavit enim haec quoque, sed perobscura fama.'

Romulus was eighteen years old when he founded Rome. On this point there was an unanimous agreement of the historians; he reigned thirty-seven years, and his death, or apotheosis, took place when he had attained the age of fifty-five. He left no descendant, or other kinsman, as a candidate for his elective throne.(85)

§ 9 Such is an outline of the narrative which is handed down to us as comprising the events of the reign of Romulus. Though brief, as compared with the original accounts, it is sufficient to enable the reader to form a judgment of its character. It does not profess to be derived from historians who were either contemporary, or who lived near the time; nor are any of its main facts supported by contemporary documents or inscriptions. It is totally devoid of all credible external attestation. On examining the texture of the history, we find that it is, with few exceptions, a mosaic, or patchwork, of explanatory legends, pieced together, and thrown into a narrative form. These legends are partly political and institutional; partly monumental and local; partly religious and ritual. In spite of his youth (for he is only eighteen years old when he founds Rome),(86) and his early life passed among herdsmen and in rustic pursuits, Romulus appears, from the very commencement of his reign, as a wise legislator, versed in all the arcana of political science. Dionysius indeed intimates more than once, that he acts on the advice of his grandfather Numitor; this expedient however does not substantially diminish the improbability and inconsistency of the received account.(87) The history is evidently constructed upon the principle of collecting all that is characteristic and excellent in the primitive institutions and condition of Rome, and attributing it to the invention of the founder Romulus.(88) The narrative is formed in the same manner as the Cyropædia of Xenophon and Plutarch's 'Life of Lycurgus:' as in those works, the institutions are real, but the account of their original establishment is fictitious, and the motives and reasons attributed to their founders are conjectural. Thus Cicero considers the formation of the Roman state as due to the wisdom of Romulus alone.(89) Consistently with this view, he enumerates all the natural and political advantages of the site of Rome, which he attributes to the foresight of Romulus, in selecting so highly favoured a position, and one so well fitted to become the capital city of a great empire.(90) The story of the birth of the twins indeed implies a different cause for the site of Rome: for according to this fable it is founded on the spot where they were exposed, suckled by the wolf, and discovered by Faustulus.(91) In pursuance of the same general view, Romulus is represented as dividing the people into tribes and curiæ, as creating the Senate, as organizing the military force, as originating the institution of the Triumph, the Spolia Opima, and the colonial law, as laying the foundations of all the religious system, and as establishing the law of marriage and of filial relations. In all these matters, his wisdom is highly commended, and he is shown in the character of the ideal king, equally prudent in council, and brave in war. At the same time, as scarcely any laws bore his name, it was necessary to say that his ordinances were for the most part unwritten: if any laws attributed to Romulus appeared in the digests of *Leges Regiæ* which existed in the Augustan age, they were only ancient legal rules, registered by the official scribes, and arbitrarily attributed by them to the founder of the state.(92) Another class of legends woven into the story of the reign of Romulus are those which explain the origin of public buildings and monuments, and other local denominations, such as the Asylum, the Temples of Jupiter Stator and Jupiter Feretrius, the Tarpeian rock, the Cælian hill, the Porta Pandana, the Lacus Curtius, the Comitium, the Forum, the names of the Curiæ. A third class are the legends of a religious or a sacred character, such as those explaining the origin of the Consualia, the Matronalia, and the Populifugia.

---

(82) Varro, de L. L. vi. 18; Plut. Rom. 29; Camill. 32; Macrob. Sat. i. 11. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 573, seems to incline to admit this story as historical, but it is rejected on sufficient grounds by Dr. Arnold, Hist. of Rome, vol. ii. p. 10, who remarks that 'little reliance is to be placed on stories pretending to account for the origin of old traditional usages or festivals.' Schwegler, ib. p. 533, thinks that no certain explanation of this festival is possible.

(83) Macrob. Sat. iii. 2; Schwegler, i. 1, p. 533.

(84) Plut. Rom, 29; Num. 2. Compare Schwegler, p. 532, n. 6; Becker, vol. i. p. 628.

(85) Dion. Hal. i. 75; ii. 56: Cic. Rep. ii. 10; Eutrop. i. 1. Plutarch, Rom. ad fin. says that Romulus lived fifty-four and reigned thirty-eight years, according to which dates he would have founded Rome at the age of sixteen. Zenodotus of Trœzen reported that Romulus had a daughter and a son by Hersilia, the former named Prima, from being the firstborn, and the latter named Aollius, or Abillius: but this account was much disputed: Plut. Rom. 14. The time of this Zenodotus is not known: he is quoted by Dionysius. See Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 531.

---

(86) Tiberius, in his funeral oration in honour of Augustus, as given by Dio Cassius, compares him with Alexander the Great and Romulus, who, he says, are the two most remarkable examples of excellence at an early age; lvi. 36. Alexander was twenty years old at the death of Philip: Augustus had only reached the age of nineteen at the death of Cæsar. (Dio Cassius, xlv. 4, calls him a youth of eighteen.)

(87) The discourse in which Romulus unfolds his general views as to government and the formation of a state is made, according to Dionysius, *ὑποθεμένου τοῦ μητροπάτορος καὶ διδάξαντος ἃ χρὴ λέγειν*, ii. 3, cf. 4. Numitor is also represented as approving of the plan for seizing the Sabine women, *γνώμην ἔσχεν, ᾗ καὶ Νομίτωρ ὁ πάππος αὐτοῦ προσέθετο*; ib. 30. The discourse of Romulus on forms of government may be compared with the debate of the Persian conspirators in Herodotus.

(88) Horace gives to Romulus the general character of a civilizer:

> Romulus, et Liber pater, et cum Castore Pollux,
> Post ingentia facta deorum in templa recepti,
> Dum terras hominumque colunt genus, aspera bella
> Componunt, agros assignant, oppida condunt, &c.
>
> Ep. ii. 1, 5-8.

Hence Octavianus wished to assume the title of Romulus, as being the second founder and organizer of Rome; but fearing lest it should be thought that he was aiming at royalty, he preferred the name of Augustus; Dio Cass. liii. 16; Suet. Oct. 7.

---

(89) Videtisne igitur, unius viri consilio non solum ortum novum populum, neque ut in cunabulis vagientem relictum, sed adultum jam et pœne puberem? De Rep. ii. 11.

(90) De Rep. ii. 3-6. Urbi autem locum, quod est ei, qui diuturnam rempublicam serere conatur, diligentissime providendum, incredibili opportunitate delegit. . . . . Hoc vir excellenti providentiâ sensit ac vidit. . . . c. 3. Qui potuit igitur divinius et utilitates complecti maritimas Romulus et vitia vitare, quam quod. &c. . . . . ut mihi jam tum divinasse ille videatur, hanc urbem sedem aliquando et domum summo esse imperio præbituram; c. 6. Respecting the natural advantages in the site of Rome, see the remarks of Mr. Laing. Notes of a Traveller, First Series, ch. 15 (Lond. 1854).

(91) Livy, i. 6, says: 'Romulum Remumque cupido cepit, in iis locis ubi expositi ubique educati erant, urbis condendæ. Dionysius, i. 85: of Numitor, *δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς χωρία ὧν ἄρξουσιν, ἔνθα παῖδες ἐτράφησαν.* Plut. Rom. 9: *ἔγνωσαν οἰκεῖν καθ' ἑαυτοὺς πόλιν ἐν οἷς χωρίοις ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐνετράφησαν κτίσαντες· αὕτη γὰρ εὐπρεπεστάτη τῶν αἰτιῶν ἐστιν.* These last words show that some other reasons, besides that here adopted, had been assigned by the writers before Plutarch. See above, p. 390.

The ancient institutions of Rome, both civil and religious, as well as names of many remarkable buildings, and public monuments, were anterior to a regular contemporary registration; or, if any authentic records of them had ever been made, they had for the most part perished, in the Gallic conflagration and through other casualties, before the Second Punic War. Even before Rome had become a great imperial power, the curiosity of her citizens would naturally be excited about the origins of her institutions, usages, and buildings; and after she had extended her dominion, and acquired a vast renown, the desire to learn the history of a system which was seen to exercise so great an influence, would naturally increase. We may therefore assume it as certain that such explanatory legends began to arise at a comparatively early period, and that the supply was multiplied as the demand increased.(93) As the remote past was unrecorded and unremembered, the invention of the ætiologist was fettered by no restrictions; he had the whole area of fiction open to him, and he was not even bound by the laws of nature. His story was only subject to the condition that it must afford an apparent explanation of the custom, object, or proper name, in question; and that the thoughts, manners, and circumstances introduced must agree with the peculiarities of the Roman people. We find accordingly that the utmost licence prevailed in the fabrication of these antiquarian legends; and that the merest resemblances of sound, or usage, were sufficient to suggest the idea of a real connexion. Thus, because the manners of the ancient Sabines were severe and simple, and their habits warlike, they were said to be colonists of the Lacedæmonians, who were distinguished by similar characteristics; although there was no historical proof of any such connexion, and it was quite unknown to the early Greek writers.(94) On similar grounds of apparent

---

(92) See Dirksen, Versuche zur Kritik und Auslegung der Quellen des Römischen Rechts (Leipzig, 1823), p. 286—305. Compare Dion. Hal. ii. 27. 'The laws ascribed to Romulus (says Schwegler) are only ancient usages, having the force of law, which were not originally enacted in writing;' vol. i. p. 528, cf. p. 23. Compare above, ch. v. § 5.

(93) 'On the third day, we came, in the solitude, upon an imposing and majestic monument of antiquity, a large city utterly abandoned. . . . Such remains of ancient cities are of no unfrequent occurrence in the deserts of Mongolia; but everything connected with their origin and history is buried in darkness. Oh, with what sadness does such a spectacle fill the soul! The ruins of Greece, the superb remains of Egypt,—all these, it is true, tell of death; all belong to the past; *yet when you gaze upon them, you know what they are;* you can retrace, in memory, the revolutions which have occasioned the ruins and the decay of the country around them. Descend into the tomb, wherein was buried alive the city of Herculaneum, —you find there, it is true, a gigantic skeleton, *but you have within you historical associations wherewith to galvanize it.* But of these old abandoned cities of Tartary, not a tradition remains; they are tombs without an epitaph, amid solitude and silence, uninterrupted except when the wan-

---

dering Tartars halt, for a while, within the ruined enclosures, because there the pastures are richer and more abundant.' Huc's Travels in Tartary, Thibet, and China, vol. i. p. 71. Engl. Transl.

M. Huc mentions that he found a Mongol shepherd among the ruins, who knew no more of the place, than that it was called 'the Old Town.' In a country inhabited by wandering pastoral tribes, such a state of incurious and satisfied ignorance respecting ancient monuments and buildings may exist: but where there are persons having a fixed habitation in the vicinity of a striking relic of antiquity, and living as its neighbours, their curiosity respecting it is excited, and if the true history of it has perished, a fabulous legend soon springs up to satisfy the cravings of the appetite for information.

(94) Livy, i. 18, speaks of the 'disciplina tetrica ac tristis veterum Sabinorum, quo genere nullum quondam incorruptius fuit.' (In this passage *genus* is used for *gens*, as in others *gens* is used for *genus*: see Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 807.) Other passages upon the severe manners of the Sabines are collected by Schwegler, i. 1, p. 243. According to Dion. Hal. ii. 49, the story of the Laconian colony in the Sabine country, at the time of Lycurgus, was to be found in native Sabine histories: these histories were probably of no great antiquity. See above, p. 199, n. 58. He traces to this source *τὸ φιλοπόλεμόν τε καὶ τὸ λιτοδίαιτον καὶ τὸ παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ βίου σκληρόν* of the Sabines. The Valerii are called Spartans by Sil. ii. 8. as being of Sabine origin. Strabo, v. 4, § 12, considers the story to have been invented by the Tarentines, who wished to establish a connexion between themselves (as a Lacedæmonian colony) and the Sabines. Cato went so far as to say that the Sabines derived their national name from Sabus, a Lacedæmonian; Krause, p. 122. Compare Schwegler, ib. p. 257; Raoul-Rochette. Hist. des Col. Grecques, tom. iii. p. 112. Mr. Bunbury (Dr. Smith's Dict. of Geogr. in v.) remarks that there is no historical ground for believing Cures to have ever been a large town, and that the importance

affinity, Dionysius affirms that Romulus copied the relation of the Roman king to the Senate, and the institution of the Celeres, and of the common table of the curiæ, from Lacedæmon.(95)

We must suppose that the legends which were worked up into the history of Romulus, were originally independent and unconnected, and referred only to the peculiar subject which they served to illustrate. At what time they were moulded into a continuous narrative, such as is now presented to us, we have not the means of discovering; but we cannot doubt that the account of Romulus from his birth to his death—from his Alban origin, and his foundation of the city, to his political measures, his wars, and lastly his apotheosis—was substantially related, by Fabius and the earliest historians, in the form in which it has descended to us. This narrative was not, like the early British history of Geoffrey of Monmouth, for the most part a purely original fiction; the materials of it were to a great extent derived from oral legends, which were incorporated into the history. At the same time, the connexion and the details must have been supplied by the first compilers: thus the story of the Asylum was some local legend; that of the Rape of the Sabines illustrated the origin of a festival; that of the intervention of the Sabine women was probably a separate story; but in the narrative, as we read it, the Asylum is the cause of the rape of the Sabine women, and the rape of the Sabine women is the cause of

---

assigned to it by Dionysius in the Sabine war was probably invented in order to suit the circumstances of the narrative.

(95) ii. 13, 14, 25. Plutarch has another mode of tracing Roman institutions to Sparta. In order to get over the chronological difficulty of Numa being the disciple of Pythagoras, who lived more than a century and a half after him, he supposes that Pythagoras the Spartan, who was victor in the sixteenth Olympiad, happened to wander to Italy, to have become acquainted with Numa, and to have assisted him in regulating his kingdom; from which circumstance many Lacedæmonian institutions were introduced at Rome; Num. 1. The custom of juniors conducting their seniors home from banquets, which prevailed at Rome, was traced to Lacedæmon, because the laws of Lycurgus prescribed great respect for old age. 'A convivio quoque, ut scriptum est in antiquitatibus, seniores a minoribus domum deducebantur, eumque morem accepisse Romanos a Lacedæmoniis traditum est; apud quos, Lycurgi legibus, major omnium rerum honos majori ætate habebatur;' Gell. ii. 15. Perhaps the Sabine settlement at Rome was derived from the resemblance of Roman and Sabine manners; Cato, ap. Serv. Æn. viii. 638; Krause, p. 122; Virg. Georg. ii. 532-3.

their interposition between the hostile armies. The three events, once independent of each other, have become continuous links in the same historical chain.

But although there is a continuity of narrative running through the story of Romulus; though the successive events stand to one another in an intelligible relation of cause and effect: yet we can trace throughout the deliberate invention of the ætiologist; we can perceive that each subject is treated after the manner of Ovid's Fasti. The story is formed by an aggregation of parts: there is no uninterrupted poetical flow, or epic unity. Instead of resembling a statue cast, in one piece, in a foundry, it is like a tesselated pavement, formed into a pattern by stones of different colours. Even Niebuhr, who conceives the story of Romulus to be founded on a heroic lay, is forced to acknowledge that parts of it are 'without the spirit or features of poetry.'(96)

The great majority of the modern critical writers agree in regarding the reign of Romulus, like the Latin colony of Æneas, the Alban kingdom, and the foundation of Rome, as lying without the province of history. But they nevertheless undertake to select certain facts, included within it, as resting on a historical basis; and they speak of the age of Romulus as a period having a fixed chronological existence. Thus Niebuhr, who (as we have already seen) supposes the whole history of Romulus to be founded on a heroic lay, nevertheless considers the division of the city between the Romans and Sabines, and the existence of a double state on neighbouring hills, as matters of fact.(97) Schwegler declares that Romulus is an imaginary personage, the eponymous hero of the city;(98) that the accounts of the foundation of Rome are fabulous;(99) that the Asylum, the Rape of the Sabines, the wars against Cænina, Crustumerium, Antemnæ, Fidenæ, and Veii, the treachery of Tarpeia, the existence of Titus Tatius, are all unhistorical;(100) yet he thinks that there is a historical foundation for the Sabine war; that the tradition of the settlement of the Sabines on the Quirinal is worthy of belief; that the account of the joint reign of Romulus and Tatius means that the federal state of the Romans and Sabines had originally two kings; and that the story of the Rape of Sabines alludes to a time when there was no reciprocal right of marriage between the two communities.(101) In like manner, although he thinks that the statements of the Roman historians concerning the three ancient tribes (Ramnes, Tities, and Luceres), and the origin of their names, do not rest on genuine tradition, but are mere conjecture, he nevertheless assumes that these were primitive divisions of the entire Roman people, and he undertakes to trace their respective national derivation.(102) It is indeed impossible, with our means of inform-

---

(96) Hist. vol. i. p. 233. Compare the remarks of Schwegler, vol. i. p. 62, 69-71. upon the prevalence of ætiological fables in the early Roman history, and their inconsistency with Niebuhr's hypothesis of its derivation from epic poems.

(97) 'That this hill (the Quirinal) was inhabited by the Sabines *is as certain as any well-established fact in the ages for which we have contemporary history:*' Hist. vol. i. p. 290. For this confident assertion, it is difficult to discover any adequate ground. Again: 'Nor have all traces of the steps by which the two towns were united into one state, been effaced. *A tradition was preserved*, that each had its king, and its senate of a hundred men,' &c.: p. 291. He interprets 'the Rape of the Sabines, and the war

---

which broke out in consequence, as indicating that at one time no right of intermarriage subsisted between the two cities, until the one which had been in subjection raised itself by arms to an equality, and even to a preponderance of power;' p. 292. See also other parts of the same chapter.

(98) i. 1, p. 418-9. (99) Ib. 450, 453.

(100) Ib. p. 465, 468, 470, 478, 485, 521, 530. Several instances of fraudulent interpretation of an argument, similar to that practised by the Sabines on Tarpeia, occur in Greek history, both fabulous and real. Thus the founders of Locri are said to have made a treaty with the Siceli, to occupy the country with them in common, so long as they trod on the same earth, and kept their heads on their shoulders: having, when they made this engagement, put earth in their shoes, and heads of garlic upon their shoulders. When these were removed, the engagement was considered to be no longer binding, and they expelled the Siceli; Polyb. xii. 6. Similar equivocations are described by Herod. iv. 201, as practised by the Persians; and by Thuc. iii. 34, as practised by Paches the Athenian. On the last case, Mr. Grote says: 'Of this species of fraud founded on literal performance and real violation of an agreement, there are various examples in Grecian history;' vol. vi. p. 327. Other instances are cited by Puffendorf, L. of N. and N. v. 12, § 3; Vatel. ii. § 273. A case of breach of engagement, but without equivocation, similar to that of Tarpeia, is cited with respect to Cyrus; Parthen. c. 22. See Schwegler, p. 485.

(101) Ib. p. 478, 480, 489, 494.

(102) Ib. p. 500; cf. 498. Schwegler considers the Ramnes to be the

ation, to form a well-grounded opinion upon the origin of the received story of Romulus, and to assert that no part of it is true. It is however possible to maintain with confidence the position that, a person holding this story to have been formed, centuries after the time of the alleged events, from legendary materials and oral relations, is not entitled to select certain points from the aggregate, upon mere grounds of apparent internal credibility, and to treat them as historical. Those, for example, who consider Romulus and Tatius as fabulous and not real personages, as mere names of actors in a fictitious drama, cannot with propriety regard their joint sovereignty as implying the separate existence of a Roman and a Sabine community on the site of Rome, and the rape of the Sabine women as typical of the absence of a right of intermarriage between them.(103) What

---

original Romans, the Tities to be the Sabines, and the Luceres to be the Albans. He believes that the first four kings represent the three ancient tribes with the plebs; p. 513. It appears to me that no materials exist for forming any probable opinion respecting the three divisions in question. Almost every modern historian of Rome takes a different view of them: but they occupy a very small space in the ancient historians, who evidently found little mention of them in the preceding writers. 'However legendary the primitive Roman history may be, it is (he says) impossible to reject, as mere fable and fiction, all that is narrated of the settlement of the Sabines, the migration of the Albans, and the arrival of Etruscan troops;' p. 504. On this allegorical mode of interpretation, see ib. p. 70-1.

Schwegler lays it down that the events of the regal period were not recorded by any contemporary historian or annalist; there is, he says, not the slightest trace of any historical registration at that time; ib. p. 35, 628. The accounts of the earliest time were propagated only by oral tradition: the earliest annalists had no documentary or authentic evidence respecting the origins of Rome: but the traditions of constitutional history were more credible than the narratives of events, which were pure fiction; p. 41; cf. 42. In p. 67, he enumerates certain 'fundamental facts' of the regal period, all relating to constitutional history, which he considers as true. In p. 342, he says that the list of Roman kings is not authentic; that neither their chronology nor number is historical, nor the persons of the first two kings. In p. 579, he says that the history of the kings is founded on no contemporary record; that it was derived exclusively from oral tradition.

(103) Schwegler himself remarks, in reference to an attempt to put a historical colouring upon the Alban colony, and the foundation of Rome by Romulus, that 'when there is a tissue of ancient legendary fiction, which, upon close examination, proves to be unhistorical in all its parts, and whose central point, the Founder of the City himself, is certainly not a historical personage, it is not safe to select from it a single feature, which is not better attested than the rest, and to treat it as historical. Nothing is more dangerous than to rationalize single elements of a legendary or

criterion is there for distinguishing between the fabulous and the historical parts of the narrative? By what test is the fact to be separated from the fiction? Before the historical character of any part of the narrative can be admitted, some probable account must be given of the means by which a true tradition, even of a single fact, was preserved until the period of Roman historiography. Those who maintain, for instance, that the extant narrative proves the existence of separate Roman and Sabine communities at Rome, in the eighth century before Christ, before the foundation of the first Greek colony in Sicily, are bound to explain how this gulf of ages was bridged over; and to show what was the ark in which authentic accounts of the time of the fabulous Romulus floated down the stream of five centuries to the age of Fabius Pictor. Who shall undertake to trace, even upon conjecture, the chain of tradition through this long, obscure period? Who can venture to affirm that it had an authentic beginning, and was preserved unfalsified until it was accurately recorded? Nor is this the only stumbling-block in our way; but we are also called upon to believe that a modern historian is able to recast the traditions which were thus preserved through the dark ages of Rome, and to extract the truth which is imbedded in them, although in their existing form they are false. We are first to believe that a tradition was, in substance, faithfully conveyed from the eighth century before Christ, to the Second Punic War, and then to believe that, although it is not literally true, it is typical of some truth which can be discerned under its covering for the first time, by a writer of our own age. This doctrine of historical types is more difficult to reconcile with reason and experience, than even the supposition that some authentic facts may have been preserved, through a long series of years, in an unaltered state, by oral tradition. It is in fact nothing more than an ingenious and refined application of the rationalist method of interpreting the marvellous legends of mythology, so

---

mythical narrative:' ib. p. 456. How the view contained in this passage can be reconciled with his treatment of certain parts of the reign of Romulus is not easy to explain.

much employed by the ancient historians. It is only another form of the system of reduction, by which the god Mars in the sacred grove was converted into an armed man in disguise, who overpowered Ilia, and the wolf of Romulus was transmuted into a courtezan. One imitation may be executed by a coarse and clumsy hand; the other may be performed with all the resources and skill of modern learning—but still they are both no better than historical forgeries.

Nothing consistent or intelligible can be extracted from the representation of the political history of Romulus, as it is given in the received narrative. He is described as an elective king, and yet his chief title to the throne seems to be that he is of the royal family of Alba. His powers are, under the constitution formed by himself, extremely limited. There is a popular assembly, with extensive privileges; a senate, of whose decrees he is merely the executor.(104) Yet all the organization of the state is derived from him alone; he is the author of all the civil and religious institutions; no person is named as taking any independent part either in the Senate or in the popular assembly. He is represented as governing mildly, and in the spirit of a constitutional king, in the early part of his reign; but as afterwards becoming despotic, although he meets with nothing but obedience at home and successes in war, and there is nothing to arouse his fears or awaken his jealousy.(105) The joint govern-

---

(104) The king was empowered *βουλήν τε συνάγειν, καὶ δῆμον συγκαλεῖν, καὶ γνώμης ἄρχειν, καὶ τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς πλείοσιν ἐπιτελεῖν.* Dion. Hal. ii. 14. The principle of decision by a majority was not known to the Homeric kings.

(105) See above, p. 430, n. 80. Livy does not speak of any change in the character of his rule, but describes him as beloved by the people, and highly popular with the army, but not acceptable to the senators: 'Multitudini tamen gratior fuit quam Patribus; longe ante alios acceptissimus militum animis;' i. 15. This account appears to be adapted to the story of the senators having put him to death. Plutarch, Rom. 27, says that when Numitor died, Romulus, in order to make himself popular, abolished the Alban royalty, and substituted annual magistrates. This account treats him as virtual sovereign of Alba.

Tacitus represents Romulus in the light of a despotic king; he considers the checks upon the royal omnipotence to have been established by Servius Tullius: 'Nobis Romulus, *ut libitum*, imperitaverat; dein Numa religionibus et divino jure populum devinxit; repertaque quædam a Tullo ment with Tatius, which is described to have lasted in the utmost harmony for five years,(106) is only conceivable on the supposition that the offices of the two kings were honorary, and unaccompanied with real power—a supposition altogether inconsistent with the spirit of the old narrative. Even the Spartan kings, small as were their powers, lived in perpetual discord; and it may be safely affirmed that such a relation as is described in the received account to have existed between Romulus and Tatius, is unexampled in authentic history.(107)

§ 10 The form of government which is recorded to have succeeded the death of Romulus, and to have lasted for a year, is equally inconsistent with experience, and its duration for so long a period is quite inconceivable. The senators (whether 100, or 150, or 200 in number),(108) are related to have divided themselves into decuriæ, or companies of ten; the order of precedence of each decuria was then determined by lot; and each of the ten senators successively exercised the entire powers of king for five days, with the title of Interrex.(109) According to this arrangement, seventy-three senators would have filled in turn the regal office during a year of 365 days. That so many

---

et Anco: sed præcipuus Servius Tullius auctor legum fuit, *queis etiam reges obtemperarent;*' Ann. iii. 28.

(106) Inde non modo commune, sed concors etiam, regnum duobus regibus fuit; Livy, i. 13. *ἔτη μὲν οὖν πέντε συνεβασίλευσαν ἀλλήλοις, ὑπὲρ οὐδενὸς διαφερόμενοι πράγματος*; Dion. Hal. ii. 50. Compare Livy, xl. 46.

(107) The account of the joint reign of the two sons of Alcetas in Epirus in Paus. i. 11, § 3, is too indistinct and brief to build any argument upon. They may have agreed to divide the kingdom. See the speech of Philip, in Livy, xl. 8.

(108) Livy states their number to have been 100; Plutarch (Num. 2), 150; Dionysius, 200.

(109) Dion. Hal. ii. 57, with whom Livy, i. 17, substantially agrees, as well as Cicero, de Rep. ii. 12, though in general terms. Plutarch, Num. 2, represents each interrex to have held the power for only six hours of the day and six hours of the night: so that they would have relieved guard like sentinels on land, or officers on watch at sea. What the origin of this statement is, does not appear. The practice in the historical age seems to have been, that the office was held for five days: Appian, B.C. i. 98; Dion. Hal. viii. 90; Livy, ix. 34. Eutropius, i. 2, and Sextus Rufus, 2, likewise give five days for the interregnum under the kings.

Dionysius seems to forget his account of the limited powers of the Roman king; for he describes the interreges as possessing an absolute authority: *ἔπειτα διακληρωσάμενοι τοῖς λαχοῦσι δέκα πρώτοις ἀπέδωκαν ἄρχειν τῆς πόλεως τὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἀρχήν*; c. 57.

transfers of the supreme power should, at a time when all constitutional and legal checks were in a very rude and inefficient state, have been quietly made, is wholly incredible. Even a community much more civilized than Rome could have been in the eighth century before Christ, above a hundred years before the legislation of Solon, could hardly pass with success through such an ordeal. A similar interregnum is related to have occurred between the reigns of Numa and Tullus Hostilius, and between those of Tullus Hostilius and Ancus Marcius; but in each case to have been of short duration. Dionysius says that the form of government was found to fail, on account of the difference of character and policy in the successive interreges; that in consequence the Senate consulted the people whether the chief power should be placed in the hands of a king, or of annual magistrates; and that the people referred the matter back to the Senate, who decided in favour of a king.(110) He does not however state (what would inevitably have happened), that this form of government led to civil discord, and to a successful attempt of some powerful and ambitious senator to retain his office for more than five days. This would be the certain result, if such a polity were attempted as a permanent mode of government. Livy finds another cause for the discontinuance of the interregal form of government: he describes the people as complaining that they had a hundred masters instead of one, and as declaring that they would not endure any king in whose election they had no voice.(111) The existence of the name and institution of the interregnum in the historical age of Rome, may be considered however as a proof of its derivation from the regal period. We can only account for it upon the supposition that it was an old constitutional form, which survived as a relic of a former state of things. It implies an elective royalty: for hereditary succession, such an institution is not needed.(112) The period of five days really existed in the historical time; and it was probably the term actually prescribed and observed under the kings, its shortness being dictated by motives of jealousy, and being intended to prevent any interrex from acquiring a dangerous power. If it was known that the election of a king was impending, the security would in general be adequate; the parties contending for the throne would take care to prevent usurpation; but a permanent government of successive five-day kings would be an impossibility, if the king was really at the head of the state, and was not a mere honorary officer.(113)

---

(110) ii. 57.

(111) Fremere deinde plebs: multiplicatam servitutem, centum pro uno dominos factos; nec ultra nisi regem, et ab ipsis creatum, videbantur passuri; Livy, i. 17. Cicero extols the sagacity of the Roman people at this time for perceiving, what Lycurgus had not discovered, that an elective is better than a hereditary royalty. 'Nostri illi, etiam tum agrestes, viderunt virtutem et sapientiam regalem, non progeniem, quæri oportere;' De Rep. ii. 12.

It may be observed, likewise, that the name of *interrex* and *interregnum* is an absurdity, as applied to the original institution, after the death of Romulus, in the form described by Cicero, Dionysius, Livy, and Plutarch. The reign of one of these five-day kings was only an interregnum in the sense that it came between the reign of a king and of another interrex, or between the reigns of two interreges. It was not conceived as intervening between the reigns of two kings.

Dionysius, as we have seen, attributes the dislike of the people for the interregal system to the changeable character of the government. Cicero refers it to their love of royalty;(114) while Livy describes it as arising from a jealousy of the power of the Senate. Livy proceeds to say, that the Senate conceded the election to the people, but retained a veto upon their choice.(115) He believes that the formal confirmation of the Senate, given in later times to the decision of the popular assembly, even before it was made, had its origin on this occasion.

---

(112) See above, p. 102.

(113) In the historical time, there was no provision which assumed that the interregnum would be of long duration; the interreges did not succeed one another from a list, but each interrex nominated his successor, if the necessity for a nomination arose. See Becker, ii. 1, p. 308.

(114) De Rep. ii. 12.

(115) Livy makes this concession the origin of the form, preserved in his own time, of giving the consent of the Senate before the election of magistrates, or the passing of laws in the Comitia; i. 17. A fabulous account of the government of Œnarea in Etruria, in Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. 94, may be compared with the description of this interregal government. The city in question is reported, from fear of falling under a single despot, to have placed the government in the hands of emancipated slaves, and to have changed them every year.

§ 11 The election of the new king is described as made by the Senate. Dionysius and Plutarch say that it was the result of a compromise between the old Roman and the new Sabine senators: the former were to make the choice; but the person chosen was to be a Sabine. The regal office was accordingly offered to Numa Pompilius, a native of the Sabine town of Cures, the son of Pompilius Pompo.(116) He was born on the natal day of Rome,(117) and was therefore thirty-eight years old: his manners were simple and austere; and he was renowned for his wisdom, and for his piety to the gods. At first, with philosophic indifference to greatness, he declined the proffered honour; but at last he yielded to entreaties, and was unanimously elected king by the Senate and the people. The ceremony by which the auspices in confirmation of his election were taken, is minutely described by Livy.(118)

---

(116) Dion. Hal. ii. 58; Livy, i. 18; Plut. Num. 3.

(117) According to Dio Cassius, vi. 5, the best informed writers on Sabine history reported this fact. See above, p. 199, n. 58. It is also stated by Plut. Num. 3.

(118) Cicero describes the election of king as made by the people, with the sanction of the Senate. See De Rep. ii. 13, 17, 18, 20. The case of Servius Tullius is mentioned as exceptional: he reigned at first with the tacit consent of the people: but he afterwards obtained its express consent, though without the intervention of the Senate; c. 21. Cicero states that each of the five kings between Romulus and Tarquinius Superbus proposed the *lex curiata de imperio*. This law he evidently conceived to have been passed by the people in *Comitia curiata*. Great importance has been attached to this account, which is peculiar to Cicero; it has been made the subject of much learned and acute discussion; and the *lex curiata de imperio* of Cicero has been identified with the *patrum auctoritas* of other writers, in order to reconcile the different testimonies. (See Becker, vol. ii. 1, p. 314—332.) All these arguments, however, suppose two postulates, neither of which can be granted: viz., 1, that the ancient writers agreed in their view of the constitutional practice under the kings; 2, that they had authentic accounts of that practice. It is clear from Cicero's account of the election of Numa, that he conceived the *auctoritas patrum* as prior to the lex curiata, and a distinct stage in the proceeding. 'Numam Pompilium—*patribus auctoribus*, sibi ipse populus adscivit, eumque ad regnandum, Sabinum hominem, Romam Curibus accivit. Qui ut huc venit, quamquam populus curiatis eum comitiis regem esse jusserat, tamen ipse de suo imperio curiatam legem tulit;' c. 13. Here the election of Numa by the people in comitia curiata, with the sanction of the Senate (patres), before he comes to Rome, is clearly described. Afterwards, when he has come to Rome, and been inducted into his office of king, he proposes to the

§ 12 Romulus, though a legislator, was regarded principally as a warlike king. Livy says, that on account of his successes in war, the state remained at peace for forty years after his death.(119) Numa, on the other hand, was a purely pacific ruler: he withdrew his subjects from all martial pursuits, and sought to civilize their rude manners;(120) for which purpose he trained them to religious observances, and the performance of sacred rites. He is described as instituting the sacred functions

---

people (also in comitia curiata) the lex curiata de imperio. The law which conferred the powers of government upon the Roman emperor was called by the later jurists *lex regia*, or *lex regia de imperio*: see Inst. i. 2, § 6. Becker, ii. 3, p. 210, n. 846. This has been identified by Niebuhr with the ancient lex curiata de imperio (Hist. vol. i. p. 343); but for this identification no sufficient ground is shown, and the *lex regia* of the empire was probably an expression of recent origin.

According to Plutarch, the father of Numa, and Marcius his kinsman, persuaded him to accept the offer; Num. 6. The envoys who brought the message to him were Proculus and Volesus; ib. 5. Spurius Vettius was the name of the interrex who put the question of his election to the vote; ib. 7. Plutarch also states that Numa married Tatia, the daughter of Titus Tatius, but that she died in the thirteenth year of her marriage, before he became king of Rome; ib. 3. This latter alliance seems to be intended to give some hereditary colour to Numa's election. In the speech of Canuleius, in Livy, iv. 3, it is stated that Numa was made king, 'populi jussu patribus auctoribus.'

(119) Ab illo enim profectu viribus datis tantum valuit, ut in quadraginta deinde annos tutam pacem haberet; i. 15. Πομπήλιος ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς πάντα τὸν τοῦ ζῆν χρόνον ἐν εἰρήνῃ διετέλεσε; Diod. viii. 15. Also Plut. Rom. 20. Horace speaks of the 'quietum Pompilî regnum;' Carm. i. 12.

(120) Qui, regno ita potitus, urbem novam, conditam vi et armis, jure eam legibusque ac moribus de integro condere parat; Livy, i. 19. Virgil and Ovid take a similar view of the relation of Numa to Romulus:

Quis procul ille autem ramis insignis olivæ,
Sacra ferens? nosco crines incanaque menta
Regis Romani; *primus qui legibus urbem*
Fundabit, Curibus parvis et paupere terrâ
Missus in imperium magnum.—Æn. vi. 809—13.

Principio nimium promptos ad bella Quirites
  Molliri placuit jure, deûmque metu,
Inde datæ leges, ne firmior omnia posset.
Fast. iii. 277—9; cf. Met. xv. 482—4.

Also Eutropius: Postea Numa Pompilius rex creatus est; qui bellum quidem nullum gessit, sed non minus civitati quam Romulus profuit. Nam et leges Romanis moresque constituit, qui consuetudine præliorum jam latrones ac semibarbari putabantur; i. 3. Homines Romanos instituto Romuli bellicis studiis ut [Numa] vidit incensos, existimavit eos paulum ab illâ consuetudine esse revocandos; Cic. Rep. ii. 13. Plutarch, Num. 8, 15, describes Numa as softening the rough minds of the Romans, and rendering them docile and obedient, by superstitious terrors. This view is quite inconsistent with the account of the legislation of Romulus in Dionysius, who makes him another Lycurgus or Solon. Above, p. 432.

of the Curiones, the Flamines, the Tribunes of the Celeres, the augurs, the Vestal virgins, the Salii, the Fetiales, the Pontifices, and the practice of procuring prodigies; he built the temples of Quirinus and Janus, and of Fides Publica;(121) he established the terminal stones on lands, and the festival of Terminalia,(122) and public games and markets. He likewise reformed the calendar; a work connected with the duties of the sacred functionaries.(123) Further than this, he made a distribution of public land among the poor citizens; he encouraged the pursuit of agriculture, and formed the *pagi*, a territorial division of the country; he likewise instituted the brotherhoods, or corporations of trades. By his healing measures, he extinguished the discord between the Roman and Sabine parts of the people.(124) His ordinances, like those of Romulus, were partly written, and partly unwritten.(125)

Numa was believed to have held secret colloquies with the nymph Egeria, and to have been guided by her advice in his sacred legislation.(126) Stories were told of his simple furniture being metamorphosed into sumptuous ornaments, worthy of a king, by her supernatural power.(127) His intercourse with this divine being was doubtless in early times received in the popular belief; and even Dionysius censures that modern atheistical philosophy which rejects all the stories of the appearances of gods to men ;(128) but those who removed everything marvellous from history, treated the story of Egeria as a pious fraud, invented by Numa in order to give authority to his laws.(129)

---

(121) Dion. Hal. ii. 63-75; Livy, i. 19-21; Plut. Num. 7, 9-13; Camill. 18; Cic. Rep. ii. 14. Dionysius, c. 75, considers the fidelity of the Romans to their engagements to have been caused by this temple of Fides Publica. The worships of Justice and Themis and Nemesis and the Erinnyes were, he thinks, ineffectual. Polybius, vi. 56, likewise attributes the honesty of the Romans in the custody of public money to the national care for religion.

(122) Dion. Hal. ii. 74; Plut. Num. 16: Cic. Rep. ii. 14 Virgil, Æn. vii. 601—15, represents the opening of the gates of the temple of Janus, as a primitive Latin custom, anterior to Æneas and the Alban state. In this as in other instances, the origin of an ancient usage fluctuated. According to Valerius Antias, Numa was the founder of the Agonalia; Macrob. Sat. i. 4. See Ovid, Fast. i. 317.

(123) Livy, i. 19; Plut. Num. 18-9. Eutropius, i. 3, says: 'Annum descripsit in duodecim menses, prius sine aliqua computatione confusum.'

(124) Dion. Hal. ii. 62, 76; Plut. Num. 16, 17; Cic. Rep. ii. 14.

(125) τὰ μὲν ἐγγράφοις περιληφθέντα νόμοις, τὰ δ' ἔξω γραφῆς εἰς ἐπιτηδεύσεις ἀχθέντα καὶ συνασκήσεις χρονίους: Dion. Hal. ii. 74.

(126) Livy, i. 19, 21; Dion. Hal. ii. 60: Plut. Num. 4, 7; Ovid, Fast. iii. 276; Met. xv. 482. Different places were identified with the grove of Egeria See Heyne, ad Æn. vii. 761; Strabo, v. 3, § 12; Juven. iii. 10—20. Diodorus, viii. 15, refers the sacred laws of Numa to the lessons of Pythagoras.

(127) Dion. Hal. ii. 60; Plut. Num. 15.

§ 13 Numa was the favourite of gods and men; his life was unchequered with adversity. During his reign, Rome enjoyed an uninterrupted flow of peace, both at home and abroad. It was a second Golden Age, which even extended to the neighbouring states.(130) His government was a realization of the Platonic idea, that in the perfect state the king must be a philosopher. His death was similar to his life; he was afflicted with no painful malady, but (according to the account of Piso) he sank into the tomb by a gentle and gradual decay, having lived more than eighty years.(131)

It was not, however, merely in his capacity of king that Numa was the embodied form of an idea. He was the mythical founder of the religious institutes and pontifical law of Rome; he was the source from which nearly all the national establishments connected with the worship of the gods were derived;

---

(128) *ὅσοι μὲν οὖν τὰς ἀθέους ἀσκοῦσι φιλοσοφίας, εἰ δὴ καὶ φιλοσοφίας αὐτὰς δεῖ καλεῖν, ἁπάσας διασύροντες τὰς ἐπιφανείας τῶν θεῶν τὰς παρ' Ἕλλησιν ἢ βαρβάροις γενομένας*, &c.; ii. 68.

(129) Dion. Hal. ii. 61, describes this class of writers as *οἱ τὰ μυθώδη πάντα περιαιροῦντες ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας*. Livy, i. 19, represents the communications with Egeria as simulated by Numa; 'Qui [deorum metus] quum descendere ad animos sine aliquo commento miraculi non posset, simulat sibi cum deâ Egeriâ congressus nocturnos esse: ejus se monitu quæ acceptissima diis essent sacra instituere.' Plut. Num. 4, ad fin., supposes a political motive, taking a similar view to that of Polybius, x. 2, concerning Lycurgus and Scipio Africanus. Numa is likewise said to have taught the Romans to revere a muse named Tacita; Plut. Num. 8.

(130) 'Such a peace of forty years, during which no nation rose against Rome, because Numa's piety was communicated to the surrounding nations, is a beautiful idea, but historically impossible in those times, and manifestly a poetical fiction;' Niebuhr, Lect. vol. i. p. 41.

(131) Dion. Hal. ii. 76; Plut. Num. 20-1; Livy. i. 21; Cic. Rep. ii. 14. Numa was related to have dissolved the Celeres (Plut. Num. 7); which was conceived as a despot's body-guard. The Celeres are described as being in existence in the time of Tarquinius Superbus: for Brutus is supposed to fill the office of tribune of the Celeres. See below, § 37.

upon him, in general, all rites and ceremonies, of unknown antiquity, were affiliated.(132) The forty-three years of his reign are as barren of events as they are of names. There is nothing in the external or internal evidence of his story to suggest the notion of a narrative of real transactions, either recorded by contemporaries or handed down by authentic oral tradition. Numa is a religious sage exercising regal powers; his government and kingdom are a model of earthly perfection; he is the true practical philosopher on the throne, dispensing blessings to all about him. Owing to the popular conception of him as a philosopher and wise man, he was represented as the scholar of Pythagoras, whose fame was doubtless more widely spread in Italy than that of Thales and other ancient philosophers of Greece and Asia Minor.(133) This belief seems to have been prevalent at Rome from an early time, and was doubtless recognised by Fabius and the other ancient historians.(134) It was embodied in the forged books of Numa's religious laws, which were brought forward as having been found in his tomb on the Janiculum in 181 B.C., about twenty years after the end of the Second Punic War.(135) When, however, Polybius and other careful historians

---

(132) The ancient satirical poet Lucilius, who was born in 184, and died in 103, B.C., couples Faunus and Numa, as the institutors of religious rites, in some verses preserved by Lactant. Div. Inst. i. 22.

Terricolas Lamias, Fauni quas Pompiliique
Instituere Numæ, tremit has, hic omnia ponit.

The singular story of the seizure of Picus and Faunus by Numa, and his subsequent colloquy with Jupiter, (recounted by Ovid, Fast. iii. 285—350; Plut. Num. 15) is a sacred legend, explanatory of the custom, still observed in Plutarch's time, of expiating lightning by onions, hair, and a fish. Plutarch can only account for the reception of this legend, by supposing Numa to have reduced the people to a state of such tameness and submission, that they believed any fable which he told them, however absurd it might be. It likewise serves as an explanation of the worship of Jupiter Elicius. See Ovid. ib. 328. Plutarch derives the word Elicius from ἵλεως. Livy, i. 20, likewise speaks of the institution of the worship of Jupiter Elicius by Numa. Concerning the altar of Jupiter Elicius, see Becker, vol. i. p. 450.

(133) In his character of a sage, he was supposed to have had grey hairs from his youth: Hic etiam canus fuit a primâ ætate. Serv. ad Æn. vi. 809. Compare Schwegler, ib. p. 519.

(134) See Dion. Hal. ii. 59; Livy. i. 18: Plut. Num. 1; Cic. Rep. ii. 15; Diod. Fragm. lib. viii. 15. He was believed to have been resident at Crotona, at the time when he was elected king; Dion. Hal. ib. Ovid likewise represents him as visiting this town, in order to profit by the teaching of Pythagoras:

Non ille satis cognosse Sabinæ
Gentis habet ritus; animo majora capaci
Concipit, et quæ sit rerum natura requirit:

Hujus amor curæ, patriâ Curibusque relictis,
Fecit ut Herculei penetraret ad hospitis urbem.
Met. xv. 4—8.

Afterwards he is described as returning from Crotona to Rome:

Talibus atque aliis instructo pectore dictis
In patriam remeasse ferunt, ultroque petitum
Accepisse Numam populi Latialis habenas.
ib. 479—81; and see Fast. iii. 153.

In Cic. Rep. ii. 15, Manilius asks 'Verene hoc memoriæ proditum est, regem istum Numam Pythagoræ ipsius discipulum, an certe Pythagoreum fuisse? Sæpe enim hoc de majoribus natu audivimus, et ita intelligimus vulgo existimari.' Scipio explains the chronological inconsistency, upon which Manilius exclaims: 'Dii immortales, quantus iste est hominum *et quam inveteratus* error!'

Various points of resemblance between the philosophy of Pythagoras and the institutions of Numa are enumerated by Plutarch, Num. 8. Among these is a prohibition to represent the gods under the form of either man or animal; and accordingly, Plutarch affirms that the Romans had no statue or painting of a god in their temples for 170 years. He adds that Epicharmus, the comic poet, in a certain prose discourse, described Pythagoras as having been admitted to the rights of Roman citizenship: but this writing could not have been genuine: above, p. 64, n. 177. Diodorus says that Numa derived his sacred institutions from Pythagoras; ib.

Pliny, N. H. xxxiv. 12, says that in the Samnite war, the oracle of Delphi ordered the Romans to erect statues to the bravest and wisest of the Greeks; whereupon they placed statues of Alcibiades and Pythagoras in the Comitium. Pliny wonders that they preferred Pythagoras to Socrates, who had been declared by Apollo the wisest of the Greeks. The account of these two statues is confirmed by Plut. Num. 8. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 310.

(135) See Pliny, N. H. xiii. 27; Livy, xl. 29; Plut. Num. 22; Val. Max. i. 1, § 12. Lactant. Div. Inst. i. 22. The discovery of these books is attested by writers nearly contemporary with the event. L. Piso, Cassius Hemina, and Sempronius Tuditanus are named by Pliny, all of whom are early historians; the first two flourished about thirty years after the year in question, and were doubtless alive at the time. See Krause, p. 148, 163, 182. The fact was likewise attested by Valerius Antias (Krause, p. 273-4) and Varro. The contents of the books are differently described, but it can scarcely be doubted that they contained allusions to the Pythagorean philosophy. Their destruction by public authority, the fresh appearance of the manuscripts, nearly five hundred years after the date of Numa's death, and the other circumstances of the case, prove beyond a doubt that they were a forgery. See above, p. 167. Valerius Antias considered the allusion to Pythagoras a proof of their recent fabrication: 'Adjicit Valerius Antias Pythagoreos fuisse, vulgatæ opinioni, quâ creditur Pythagoræ auditorem fuisse Numam, mendacio probabili accommodatâ fide.' Livy, ib. There was a sacred place in the Forum Boarium, near the mouth of the Cloaca Maxima, called Doliola, in which it was forbidden to spit. As usual, there were several legends to explain the origin of the

came to compare the time assigned to Numa with the date of Pythagoras, they perceived that the disciple must have lived above a century and a half before the master, and therefore that the story was false.(136) The anachronism is, as if it were said

---

name and of the custom. One referred it to certain sacred objects, which were here buried in casks (doliola), at the time of the Gallic invasion; another related that some religious relics (or books) of Numa were buried here after his death. See Varro L. L. v. 157; Livy, v. 40; Festus, p. 69; Becker, vol. i. p. 484.

(136) There are two accounts of the age of Pythagoras, differing from each other by nearly forty years. One places his birth at 608 or 605, and his death at 510 B.C.: the other places his birth at 570, and his death at 472 B.C. See Clinton, F. H. vol. ii. ad ann. 539. 'Although the dates of his birth and death are wholly uncertain, yet all authorities agree that he flourished B.C. 540—10, in the times of Polycrates and Tarquinius Superbus.' Clinton ad a. 510, cf. 472. The life of Numa, according to the received chronology, extends from 753 to 673 B.C.: and his reign begins in 715 B.C. His residence at Crotona must therefore have been not later than 715 B.C., which would be at least a century and a half before the flourishing period of Pythagoras, according to the earliest date. Cicero, de Rep. ii. 15 (probably following Polybius) says that Pythagoras came to Italy in the fourth year of Tarquinius Superbus, in Olymp. 62, about 530 B.C. This agrees with his statement in another place, that Numa was nearly two centuries before Pythagoras: De Orat. ii. 37. That Pythagoras came into Italy in the reign of Tarquinius Superbus is also stated by Cic. Tusc. i. 16, and by Gellius, xvii. 21, § 6. According to Dion. Hal. ii. 59, Pythagoras lived four generations (about 120 years) after Numa; Numa's reign began in the middle of Olymp. 16. [Olymp. 16.2=715 B.C.] and the residence of Pythagoras in Italy dated from Olymp. 50=580 B.C. Dionysius adds that Crotona, where Numa was related to have visited Pythagoras, was not founded until Olymp. 17.3, four years after the beginning of the reign of Numa. (See Clinton, ad ann. 710.) Plutarch, Num. 1, says that Numa was nearly five generations after Pythagoras. Livy adopts another date: he declares that Pythagoras lived in Southern Italy more than one hundred years after Numa, in the reign of Servius Tullius. He adds that even if Pythagoras had been contemporary with Numa, his philosophy could not have travelled as far as the Sabines; a remark which shows that he was ignorant of the belief, reported by Dionysius, and versified by Ovid, that Numa visited his master at Crotona—'Ex quibus locis, etsi ejusdem ætatis fuisset, quæ fama in Sabinos, aut quo linguæ commercio, quemquam ad cupiditatem discendi excivisset? quove præsidio unus per tot gentes, dissonas sermone moribusque, pervenisset?' i. 18.

Niebuhr has the following remarks upon this chronological inconsistency: 'An impartial critic, who does not believe that the son of Mnesarchus was the only Pythagoras, or that what Aristoxenus and the older writers left undecided, has been settled, because chronologers have made up their minds on the question, or that there is any kind of necessity for placing Numa in the twentieth Olympiad, or, in fine, that the historical personality of Pythagoras is more certain than that of Numa, will be pleased with the old popular opinion, and will not sacrifice it to chronology.' Hist. vol. i. p. 238. The hypothesis that there may have been *another* Pythagoras is rejected even by Dionysius (ii. 59, ad fin.), and is one of the that James I. derived his maxims of government from Adam Smith, or Henri IV. from Montesquieu. As this legend could not have arisen until the age of Pythagoras,(137) and the fact of his being contemporary with the last king, or with the first years of the Republic, had been forgotten, we can hardly suppose it to have been much earlier than the capture of Rome by the Gauls.

One origin, unconnected with religion, was traced to Numa. For this he was indebted to an accidental resemblance of sound. Suetonius reported that he introduced iron and brass, instead of leather and earthenware, for money at Rome, and that he called it *nummus* after his own name. This etymological fiction was adopted by subsequent writers.(138) Other accounts attributed the origin of coined money at Rome to Servius Tullius.(139)

---

last resources of desperate critics. The attempt to save the story by referring it to Pythagoras the Spartan, who was victor in the sixteenth Olympiad (Plut. Num. i. approved by Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 12; cf. Dion. Hal. ii. 58), is an equally hopeless expedient. The chronology of Pythagoras is not certain, but it is fixed, on fair evidence, within narrow limits; and there is no reasonable ground for doubting of his historical personality. See Grote, Hist. of Greece, vol. iv. p. 525—52. With respect to Numa, indeed, not only his chronology, but his existence is insufficiently attested; if, however, we reject the received dates of his life and reign, we cannot substitute any others.

(137) The process of invention is well described by Cicero and Dionysius in the following passages: 'Quinetiam arbitror, propter Pythagoreorum admirationem, Numam quoque regem Pythagoreum a posterioribus existimatum. Nam quum Pythagoræ disciplinam et instituta cognoscerent, regisque ejus æquitatem et sapientiam a majoribus suis accepissent, ætates autem et tempora ignorarent propter vetustatem, eum, qui sapientiâ excelleret, Pythagoræ auditorem crediderunt fuisse.' Tusc. iv. 1: *ἀλλ' ἐοίκασιν οἱ τὰ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γράψαντες, εἰ χρὴ δόξαν ἰδίαν ἀποφήνασθαι, δύο ταῦτα λαβόντες ὁμολογούμενα, τήν τε Πυθαγόρου διατριβὴν γενομένην ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, καὶ τὴν Νομᾶ σοφίαν, (ὁμολογεῖται γὰρ ὑπὸ πάντων ὁ ἀνὴρ γενέσθαι σοφὸς,) ἐπισυνάψαι ταῦτα καὶ ποιῆσαι Πυθαγόρου μαθητὴν Νομᾶν, οὐκέτι τοὺς βίους αὐτῶν ἐξετάσαντες, εἰ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἤκμασαν ἀμφότεροι χρόνους, ὅπερ ἐγὼ πεποίηκα νῦν*, ii. 59. Zaleucus, the ancient Locrian lawgiver, was also believed to have been the disciple of Pythagoras (see Diod. xii. 20; Diog. Laert. viii. 16); although his legislation is placed at 660 B.C., about a century before the time of Pythagoras. See Clinton, ad ann. 660.

(138) Suidas in *ἀσσάρια*. Compare Boeckh, Metrologie, p. 162. The leather money attributed to the Lacedæmonians, and also that mentioned in this passage, are rejected as fabulous by Boeckh, Econ. of Ath. b. 4, c. 19. Concerning a leather covering for money used by the Carthaginians, see Plat. Eryx. 17. Earthenware money does not appear to be elsewhere mentioned.

(139) Below, § 31.

Numa was related to have left four sons and one daughter; to whom, as mythical progenitors, various Roman families subsequently traced their origin.(140) Cn. Gellius affirmed that he had only one child, a daughter, named Pompilia. These were said to be the children of his wife Tatia, who died before he became king; others however affirmed that Pompilia was the daughter of a certain Lucretia, whom he married after he ascended the Roman throne. All the authorities agreed that Pompilia became the wife of Marcius, the son of the Marcius who advised Numa to accept the royal dignity, and the father of Ancus Marcius the fourth King of Rome.

§ 14 At the death of Numa, the forms of an interregnum were observed, and the interrex declared that the choice of the people had fallen upon Tullus Hostilius.(141) He was the grandson of a citizen of Medullia, of the same name, who migrated to Rome, and married Hersilia, the leader of the Sabine women in their embassy to Tatius.(142)

Tullus Hostilius is described as having divided the royal demesne land among the poorer citizens;(143) but, with this exception, all his acts are warlike. He forms a perfect contrast to his predecessor; whose reign of uninterrupted peace is succeeded by a reign of military successes.(144)

---

(140) Dion. Hal. ii. 76; Plut. Num. 6, 21; Cic. Rep. ii. 18. The four sons of Numa were named Pompo, Pinus, Calpus, and Mamercus. Pompo was the eponymous ancestor of the Pomponii; Pinus of the Pinarii; Calpus of the Calpurnii; Mamercus of the Mamerci, a family of the Æmilian gens. The name of Mamercus was connected with a son of Pythagoras, Plut. ib. 8; Festus in Æmiliam, p. 23. Other origins were however found for the Mamerci and Pinarii. Compare Festus in Calpurni, p. 47, and Müller's note. See above, p. 293, n. 92. The Pomponii and Calpurnii placed the head of Numa on their coins. Plutarch speaks of the pedigrees traced up to Numa being fabricated in order to flatter the vanity of great families. See the passage of Clodius in c. 1, and compare c. 21. τρίτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ τούτων μὲν κατηγοροῦντες, ὡς χαριζομένων τοῖς γένεσι, καὶ προστιθέντων οὐκ ἀληθῆ στέμματα.

(141) Dion. Hal. iii. 1; Livy, i. 22. Compare Cic. Rep. ii. 17. Mortuo rege Pompilio, Tullum Hostilium populus regem, interrege rogante, comitiis curiatis creavit, isque de imperio suo, exemplo Pompilii, populum consuluit curiatim. Plutarch says that Marcius, the friend of Numa, and the grandfather of Ancus Marcius the fourth king, contested the election with Tullus Hostilius, and, having been defeated, starved himself to death. Num. 21. The other writers are silent about this contest.

(142) This Hostilius is said to have distinguished himself by his military exploits; and to have been crowned with a chaplet of leaves by Romulus, for having first entered the walls of Fidenæ. Plin. H. N. xvi. 5.

(143) Dion. Hal. iii. 1. Livy says nothing of this measure.

§ 15 The first, and most important event in the reign of Tullus Hostilius is the war with Alba, the mother-city of Rome. According to Dionysius, it was owing to Cluilius, the king, or dictator of Alba, who was jealous of the power of Rome;(145) according to Livy, it had its origin in the restless ambition of Tullus Hostilius. The hostile armies first approached one another at a place about five miles from the city, afterwards called *Fossa Cluilia*; it received this name as being the work of the Alban general, who was here found dead in his tent, without any apparent cause of death.(146) Mettius Fuffetius was elected by the army to fill the vacant office.(147) The national affinity between Alba and Rome renders the leaders of the two armies unwilling to bring about a general engagement; and an agreement is accordingly made that a combat between three champions on each side shall decide the questions at issue between the two states.(148) According to the account of Dionysius, Sicinius, a citizen of Alba, had twin daughters, one of whom he married to Horatius, a Roman, the other to Curiatius, an Alban. Each of them produced three sons at the first birth; and all the children were reared by the parents.(149) These were the warriors between whom, notwithstanding their near relationship, the battle was to take place. Livy knows nothing of their affinity; and he adds that it is even uncertain to which nation each set of brothers belonged—though the majority of writers considered the Horatii as Romans.(150) The battle, after

---

(144) This contrast is indicated by Virgil:

Cui deinde subibit,
Otia qui rumpet patriæ, residesque movebit
Tullus in arma viros, et jam desueta triumphis
Agmina.—Æn. vi. 813-6.

Hic non solum proximo regi dissimilis, sed ferocior etiam Romulo fuit; tum ætas viresque, tum avita quoque gloria animum stimulabat. Livy, i. 22.

(145) Dion. Hal. iii. 2, who describes the office of Cluilius, by saying that he was *τῆς μεγίστης ἀρχῆς ἀξιωθείς*. Livy, i. 22, says, Imperitabat tum Cluilius Albæ; afterwards he is called 'Albanus rex,' c. 23. Plutarch Num. 27, describes Romulus as having abolished the regal office at Alba on the death of Numitor, and having substituted annual magistrates. According to Licinius Macer, these Alban magistrates were called dictators; Dion. Hal. v. 74. Compare the account of the origin of the war in Dion. Hal. iii. 2-3, with Diod. viii. 33.

(146) Dion. Hal. iii. 4, says that the Albans pitch their camp *περὶ τὰς καλουμένας Κλοιλίας τάφρους· φυλάττουσι γὰρ ἔτι τὴν τοῦ κατασκευάσαντος αὐτὰς ἐπίκλησιν*. Livy's account is as follows: 'Castra ab urbe haud plus quinque millia passuum locant, fossâ circumdant: fossa Cluilia ab nomine ducis per aliquot secula appellata est, donec cum re nomen quoque vetustate abolevit;' i. 23. Niebuhr has the following remark respecting the Fossa Cluilia: 'The name of the ditch was *unquestionably* derived from an Alban prince; for the sake of explaining this name, the story was invented that the armies encamped a long time in this place, and, since Fuffetius appears subsequently as the prætor of the Albans, that Cluilius died here.' Hist. vol. i. note 870. Niebuhr elsewhere identifies the Fossa Cluilia with a tunnel, half a mile in length, cut in the rock, through a hill between the valley of Grottaferrata and the Campagna. 'Its course at first was probably toward the sea: *but even in the time of the Roman kings it was turned into the city;* where it now flows through the valley of the Circus into the Tiber, bearing the name of La Marrana all the way from its origin. The portion of the dyke above the spot where the Romans turned it off, is the Fossa Cluilia, *so called after the Alban dictator, by whom this great*

---

work was executed.' ib. p. 204. The whole of this passage rests on mere conjecture. There is nothing to show that the Fossa Cluilia was really named after an Alban dictator; nor is the age of the tunnel to which Niebuhr refers determined by any sure datum. It may be of a much later age than that to which Niebuhr assigns it. The words of Livy seem to imply that not only the name of the ditch, but the very ditch itself, had disappeared before his time, which is inconsistent with the idea of its being a tunnel cut in the rock, preserved even to the present day. Moreover, the legend that it was made as a moat round a camp, was doubtless adapted to its character; and on this account also a tunnel of the magnitude described by Niebuhr would disagree with the conditions of the story. This General is called 'Tutor Cloelius' in the writer De Prænominibus, c. 1 (at the end of Valerius Maximus, ed. Kempf.).

(147) Dion. Hal. iii. 5; Livy, i. 23. Dio Cassius, vii. 2, appears to represent the original rivalry as arising between Mettius Fuffetius and Tullus; which supposes that he did not recognise the share of Cluilius in the war.

(148) Dion. Hal. iii. 6—17; Livy, i. 23-4.

(149) *ἃ οἱ γεινάμενοι, πρὸς οἰωνοῦ λαβόντες ἀγαθοῦ καὶ πόλει καὶ οἴκῳ τῷ σφετέρῳ, τρέφουσιν ἅπαντα καὶ τελειοῦσι*; Dion. Hal. iii. 13. This remark of Dionysius proves that the common practice in his time was not to rear all the children, where there was more than one at a birth. Niebuhr, in this marvellous tale, discovers an allegory: 'Everybody (he says) will perceive that we have here types of the two nations regarded as sisters, and of the three tribes in each of them;' vol. i. note 871.

(150) Forte in duobus tum exercitibus erant trigemini fratres, nec ætate nec viribus dispares. Horatios Curiatiosque fuisse satis constat; nec ferme res antiqua alia est nobilior; tamen in re tam clarâ nominum error manet, utrius populi Horatii, utrius Curiatii fuerint. Auctores utroque trahunt; plures tamen invenio qui Romanos Horatios vocent: hos ut sequar inclinat animus; i. 24. Livy proceeds to set out at length the forms of

great alternations of fortune, is decided in favour of the Romans; but the surviving Horatius, in the moment of victory, becomes the object of the divine Nemesis.(151) Offended by the regret of his sister for one of the Curiatii, to whom she was betrothed, he stabs her, on his return from the field. This deed was approved by his father, who refused even to bury his daughter's remains, on account of her unpatriotic conduct; and he celebrated the public triumph with sacrifices and banquets notwithstanding his domestic calamity—a custom which, says Dionysius, the Romans kept up in later times.(152) Her tomb was afterwards shown near the Porta Capena, in the spot where she was believed to have fallen.(153) This homicidal act, however, does not remain unnoticed: according to Livy, Horatius is brought before the king, and accused of the murder. The king, unwilling to condemn the champion of his country in the hour of triumph, appoints two criminal judges to try him. These judges had already sentenced him to death, and the lictors were preparing to execute the sentence, when Horatius appealed to the people, exercising a right which the law permitted.(154) The popular tribunal was more lenient: it was adjudged that his offence should be expiated at the public expense.(155) Some piacular sacrifices accordingly were performed, which became hereditary in the gens Horatia; and a beam was erected across the

---

the treaty made between the Romans and Albans. These forms are curious and probably authentic. They were doubtless taken from some ancient official collection of legal formulæ, and adapted to this occasion. Compare Niebuhr, vol. i. p. 346.

(151) It was necessary, says Dionysius, *τοῦτον ἄνθρωπον ὄντα μὴ πάντα εὐτυχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀπολαῦσαί τι τοῦ φθονεροῦ δαίμονος*; iii. 21. In c. 18, he speaks of the events after the battle as *θεατρικαῖς ἐοικότα περιπετείαις*.

(152) Dion. Hal. iii. 21. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 571.

(153) Horatiæ sepulcrum, quo loco corruerat icta, constructum est saxo quadrato, Livy, i. 26, who previously mentions that the place of meeting was 'ante portam Capenam.' Dionysius says that the passers-by cast stones upon her body to cover it. This does not agree with the 'saxum quadratum.' See Becker, vol. i. p. 517.

(154) Victor, de Vir. Ill. c. 4, § 9, follows Livy: Quare apud duumviros condemnatus, ad populum provocavit.

(155) Cic. pro Mil. 3, says that Horatius was acquitted by the comitia of the people.

street, under which the culprit was passed with his head covered, as a conquered enemy was passed under the yoke. This beam, or gallows, was called *Sororium tigillum*, and continued, in the time of Livy, to be repaired at the public cost.(156) The place where the arms of the Curiatii were fixed, was likewise known by the name of *Pila Horatia*.(157) The tombs of the three Curiatii and the two Horatii were also shown in the places where they were believed to have fallen.(158) Dionysius gives a different account of the transaction. He describes Horatius as accused by certain citizens before the king, and defended by his father; whereupon the king refers the question to the decision of the people; this being the first occasion on which the Roman people exercised jurisdiction in a case of life and death.(159) The popular tribunal absolves Horatius; but the king orders the crime to be expiated by religious ceremonies. Then follows the account of the piacular rites and the Tigillum Sororium, as in Livy; with the addition that two altars were erected, one to Juno Sororia, the other to Janus Curiatius.

---

(156) Is, [the father] quibusdam piacularibus sacrificiis factis, quæ deinde genti Horatiæ tradita sunt, transmisso per viam tigillo, capite adoperto, velut sub jugum misit juvenem. Id hodie quoque publice semper refectum manet. Sororium tigillum vocant; i. 26. Dionysius describes it as follows: *ξύλον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν* [the two altars] *τέταται δυσὶ τοῖς ἀντικρὺ ἀλλήλων τοίχοις ἐνηρμοσμένον, ὃ γίνεται τοῖς ἐξιοῦσιν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς, καλούμενον τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ ξύλον ἀδελφῆς*; iii. 21. Festus, p. 297, says that the Sororium tigillum consisted of 'duo tigilla tertio superjecto.' It is mentioned as an existing monument by Victor de Vir. Ill. c. 4, § 9, Sub tigillum missus, quod nunc quoque, viæ suppositum [superpositum, Becker], Sororium appellatur; and it remained till the fifth or sixth century: see the Regionary, p. 6-7, ed. Preller, and the editor's note, p. 128. The piacular sacrifices are also mentioned by Dionysius: *τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τὸ χωρίον τῆς συμφορᾶς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μνημεῖον ἐν τῇ πόλει ἔτι φυλάττει, θυσίαις γεραιρόμενον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων καθ᾽ ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτόν*; ib. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 527-9, concerning the place of this monument. *Tigillum* and *tignum* seem to be equivalent terms.

(157) Spolia Curiatiorum fixa in eo loco, qui nunc Pila Horatia appellatur, Livy, i. 26. *ἕτερον δὲ τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἣν ἀπεδείξατο κατὰ τὴν μάχην, μαρτύριον ἡ γωνιαία στυλίς, ἡ τῆς ἑτέρας παστάδος ἄρχουσα ἐν ἀγορᾷ, ἐφ᾽ ἧς ἔκειτο τὰ σκῦλα τῶν Ἀλβανῶν τριδύμων. τὰ μὲν οὖν ὅπλα ἠφάνισται διὰ μῆκος χρόνου, τὴν δ᾽ ἐπίκλησιν ἡ στυλὶς φυλάττει τὴν αὐτήν, Ὁρατία καλουμένη πίλα*; Dion. Hal. iii. 21. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 298, who thinks that the word *pila*, in the sense of *pillar*, is a misunderstanding of the original word, which denoted the javelins and arms of the Horatii. His argument that there were no pillars in the Forum in the time of Tullus Hostilius has little weight, for we do not know the real origin, or age, of the name *Pila Horatia*. See Schwegler, p. 572.

(158) Sepulcra extant, quo quisque loco cecidit. Duo Romana uno loco propius Albam, tria Albana Romam versus; sed distantia locis, et ut pugnatum est; Livy, i. 25. Dionysius states that the combatants were buried in the places where they fell; iii. 22.

(159) *γενόμενος δὲ θανατηφόρου κρίσεως τότε πρῶτον ὁ Ῥωμαίων δῆμος κύριος;*

§ 16 The combat of the Horatii and Curiatii does not however produce any permanent result, or lead to a sincere reconciliation between Alba and Rome. A war shortly afterwards breaks out with Fidenæ, a Roman colony, and Veii, the Etruscan city ;(160) Mettius Fuffetius comes as an ally to Rome, but manifests his treachery during the battle. The Romans are in great peril, but succeed in gaining the victory; Tullus Hostilius having, at the moment of the greatest alarm, vowed temples to Pallor and Pavor, as well as the institution of the twelve Salii.(161) Fuffetius is punished by a cruel death, of which no other instance occurs in Roman history: his body is torn asunder by horses harnessed to different chariots.(162) The town of Alba is de-

---

iii. 22. Dionysius says nothing of the *duumviri*, who play so important a part in the narration of Livy. The words 'caput obnubito, arbori infelici suspendito' (which occur in the formula attributed by Livy, i. 26, to the time of Tullus Hostilius) were the 'cruciatus carmina' of Tarquinius Superbus, according to Cicero, pro Rabir. perduell. 4.

(160) Dionysius places the original defection of Fidenæ and Veii before the combat of the Horatii and Curiatii; iii. 6-7. Livy places it after; i. 27. The combat of the Horatii and Curiatii was described in the Annals of Ennius:

'Et cecinit Curios fratres, et Horatia pila.'—Propert. iii. 3, 7.

Fragments of Ennius are extant, in which he mentions Horatius and Metius Fufetius: Festus in Occasus, p. 178; and Quintilian, i. 5, § 12.

(161) Tullus in re trepidâ duodecim vovit Salios, fanaque Pallori ac Pavori; Livy, i. 27. There were twelve Salii, called Palatini, from their holy place being on the Palatine hill: they were said to have been instituted by Numa; Dion. Hal. ii. 70; Livy, i. 20. There were likewise twelve Salii, called Agonales, or Collini, whose holy place was in the Colline region: they were said to have been instituted by a vow of Tullus Hostilius. Livy, however, places the vow in the battle against the Fidenates and Veientes, while Dionysius refers it to a subsequent war with the Sabines; ii. 70, iii. 32. Dio Cassius, vii. 5. attributes the foundation of the Colline Salii to Tullus, but connects it with his superstitious feelings brought on by the attack of a pestilential disease. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. iii. p. 351, conjectures that the distinction of the colleges of Salii was connected with the early tribes; but this is a point upon which nothing can be ascertained.

(162) Primum ultimumque illud supplicium apud Romanos exempli parum memoris legum humanarum fuit. In aliis gloriari licet, nulli gentium mitiores placuisse pœnas; Livy, i. 28: Dion. Hal. iii. 30; Florus,

molished, with the exception of its temples, having stood for four or five centuries, since it was founded by Ascanius.(163) The population is transferred to Rome; and seven Alban families are admitted into the Patrician order, and made members of the Senate.(164) Livy and Dionysius agree in the cardinal facts; but all the circumstances of the war—its origin, the relations of Fidenæ, Veii, and Alba, and the conduct of Fuffetius—are differently related by them.(165) The former enters into great detail, and throughout the narrative of the Alban war introduces numerous and long harangues, imitated from the manner of Thucydides; the latter is more brief, but his description of the demolition of Alba is picturesque and pathetic, and is composed as if it were derived from the report of an eye-witness.(166)

---

i. 3, § 8; Virg. Æn. viii. 642; Gell. N. A. xx. 1, § 54; Ovid, Trist. i. 3, 75; Ibis, 281; Claudian, Bell. Gildon. 254. Plutarch, Parall. 7, gives a different version of the offence of Fuffetius, and compares it with the death of Pyræchmes, king of the Eubœans, whom Hercules caused to be torn in pieces by horses. The execution of Bessus is variously described: according to Plut. Alex. 43, he was rent asunder by bent trees. Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer, p. 692, quotes an historical example of this mode of capital execution from Gregory of Tours, and Turpin describes Gannalon the traitor as having been put to death in this manner. It was likewise used in the cruel execution of Damien, in the year 1757. See Notes and Queries, vol. iii. p. 91-2.

(163) See above, ch. x. § 1. Livy and Dionysius both expressly mention the single exception made in favour of the temples. Templis tamen deûm (ita enim edictum ab rege fuerat) temperatum est; i. 29. *μήτε δημοσίων μήτε ἰδιωτικῶν κατασκευασμάτων ὀρθόν τι ἐᾶσαι διαμένειν μηθὲν ἔξω τῶν ἱερῶν*; iii. 29. *ὕστερον δὲ πολέμου σύσταντος ἡ μὲν Ἄλβα κατεσκάφη πλὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ*; Strab. v. 3, § 4. Compare Livy, xxvi. 13.

(164) Dionysius enumerates seven families,—1. Julii; 2. Servilii; 3. Geganii; 4. Metilii; 5. Curiatii; 6. Quintilii; 7. Cloelii; iii. 30. Livy omits the Metilii; for Julii he gives Tullii, and Quinctii for Quintilii, i. 30. The Julii are elsewhere mentioned as an Alban family by Dionysius; i. 70. Livy represents Tullus Hostilius as building the Curia Hostilia, in consequence of this increase of the Senate. Templumque ordini ab se aucto curiam fecit, quæ Hostilia usque ad patrum nostrorum ætatem appellata est; ib. Compare Cic. Rep. ii. 17; Varro, L. L. v. 155, and Becker, vol. i. p. 284. In iv. 68, Dionysius speaks of the Julii being descended from a companion of Æneas; which implies that they were considered to have been an Alban family; Alba being a necessary link between Æneas and Rome.

(165) Dion. Hal. iii. 22—31; Livy, i. 27—30. Compare Victor de Vir. Ill. c. 4; Florus, i. 3.

(166) Legiones deinde ductæ ad diruendam urbem. Quæ ubi intravere portas, non quidem fuit tumultus ille nec pavor, qualis captarum esse

The next event is a Sabine war, the cause of which is similarly described by Dionysius and Livy; it is decided in favour of the Romans, in a battle near a place called *Silva Malitiosa.*(167) Dionysius adds that, fifteen years after the demolition of Alba, the Romans attempting to enforce the supremacy over the Latin tribes, which had belonged to Alba, met with resistance. The Latins elect two dictators, Ancus Publicius of Cora, and Spurius Vecilius of Lavinium, and a war begins which lasts for five years, but is carried on in a humane manner, as between cities of the same nation.(168) This Latin war is not mentioned by Livy.

§ 17 Of the death of Tullus Hostilius there are two accounts, one supernatural, the other reduced to a standard of probability.(169) According to the marvellous version, Hostilius, who, during his military career, had disdained all religious observances, was seized with a fear of the gods, and a respect for his predecessor, in consequence of being afflicted with a pestilential malady.(170) Desirous of imitating the practices of Numa,

---

urbium solet, quum, effractis portis, stratisve ariete muris, aut arce vi captâ, clamor hostilis et cursus per urbem armatorum omnia ferro flammâque miscet: sed silentium triste ac tacita mœstitia ita defixit omnium animos, ut, præ metu obliti quid relinquerent quid secum ferrent, deficiente consilio, rogitantesque alii alios, nunc in liminibus starent, nunc errabundi domos suas, ultimum illud visuri, pervagarentur. Ut vero jam equitum clamor exire jubentium instabat, jam fragor tectorum quæ diruebantur, ultimis urbis partibus audiebatur, pulvisque ex distantibus locis ortus, velut nube inductâ omnia impleverat; raptim quibus quisque poterat elatis, quum larem ac penates, tectaque in quibus natus quisque educatusque esset, relinquentes exirent: jam continens agmen migrantium impleverat vias; et conspectus aliorum mutuâ miseratione integrabat lacrimas; vocesque etiam miserabiles exaudiebantur; mulierum præcipue, quum obsessa ab armatis templa augusta præterirent, ac velut captos relinquerent deos; Livy, i. 29. Compare Dion. Hal. iii. 31.

(167) Livy, i. 30. According to Dionysius, there is first a battle near Eretum, afterwards another, περὶ τὴν καλουμένην ὕλην κακούργων; iii. 32-33. Livy's statement, i. 30, that Veii abstained from all public alliance with the Sabines, on account of the truce with Romulus, and that none but private volunteers joined the war, is scarcely consistent with his own account, in c. 27, of the alliance of the Veientes with the Fidenates against Rome.

(168) Dion. Hal. iii. 34. Compare Diod. viii. 34.

(169) Livy. i. 31; Plut. Num. 22; Dion. Hal. iii. 35; Zonaras, vii. 6. The first version alone is mentioned by Livy and Plutarch.

(170) See Dio Cass. vii. 5.

but unable to reach his skill in the performance of proper expiatory rites, he provoked the anger of Jupiter, instead of mitigating it; and he was, together with his whole family, destroyed by lightning.(171) The other, and, according to Dionysius, the more generally received version, was, that Ancus Marcius being a descendant of Numa, through his mother, was desirous of preventing the sons of Tullus from succeeding to the throne; that he and some associates entered the royal palace on a cloudy day, when Tullus was engaged in some domestic sacrifice, murdered the king and his family, and afterwards set the palace on fire; and that they circulated the report of the death by lightning in order to conceal their own crime. Dionysius however gives the preference to the former version of the story: he thinks that an act in which so many must have been concerned could not have been concealed; that the chief conspirator could not have relied on his being elected king; and that even if all human impediments had been removed, the gods would have refused the necessary omens to a man whose hands were stained with blood.(172) For these reasons, Dionysius considers the death of Tullus to have been owing not to the contrivance of men, but to the will of God.

§ 18 The reign of Tullus Hostilius, like those of his two predecessors, is destitute of all authentication by coeval written evidence; nor are we able to discover any means by which a correct account of it could, through the channel of oral tradition, have reached the age of Fabius Pictor. Its chief event is the war with the Albans, and the consequent demolition of their city, the cradle of the Roman state. A large part of this narrative comes before us in the suspicious form of explanations of certain names of places and buildings; of topographical and monumental legends. The Fossa Cluilia, the tombs of the Horatii and Curiatii, and also the tomb of Horatia, the Pila Horatia, the Sororium Tigillum, the altars of Juno Sororia and Janus Curiatius, and the piacular rites of the Horatian family, are the several pegs to which a large portion of the story is attached. The trial of Horatius likewise serves as an occasion for introducing the primitive right of appeal to the people, in capital trials for homicide. Again, the story of the demolition of Alba explains the existence of temples on the ancient site of the town, and enables certain Roman families to trace their origin to families of Alba. Some of these memorials have been regarded as conclusive proofs of the reality of the events which they are supposed to record;(173) but the existence of the tombs of the Horatii and Curiatii, and of the Sororium Tigillum, for example, is not a better proof of the celebrated combat, to which they are referred, than the tools of Epeus at Metapontum are of the Trojan horse, or the pickled sow at Lavinium, of the prodigy seen by Æneas. Some trustworthy contemporary testimony is necessary in order to prove the occurrence of an event, before the connexion of a monument with that event can be established. Where the contemporary testimony implies the continued existence of a monument, its existence in later times is a powerful confirmation of the truth of that testimony. Thus the clear extant remains of a canal across the promontory of Athos serve to corroborate the account in Herodotus of its excavation by Xerxes.(174) In like manner, the ancient accounts of the construction of the Flavian amphitheatre at Rome are supported by the vast ruin of the Coliseum. On the other hand, the statements of several ancient writers respecting the gigantic size of the walls of Babylon are rendered improbable by the entire absence of all traceable remains of these supposed bulwarks: if their extent, height, and thickness were what they are reported to have been, it seems incredible that every vestige of them should have disappeared.(175) But where the event which serves to explain the monument is unrecorded by independent credible evidence, the mere existence of the monument is not a proof of the event.(176) The true origin of the monument may have been forgotten, and its unexplained existence may have served as an inducement to invent a legend in order to account for it. Such ætiological legends may, as is proved by many examples in the Greek mythology, and in Ovid's Fasti, be imaginative and poetical: they are however necessarily insulated and unconnected, until by the skill of the subsequent compiler, they are woven into the texture of a consecutive historical narrative.(177)

---

(171) Ipsum regem tradunt, volventem commentarios Numæ, quum ibi quædam occulta solemnia sacrificia Jovi Elicio facta invenisset, operatum his sacris se abdidisse: sed non rite initum aut curatum id sacrum esse; nec solum nullam ei oblatam cœlestium speciem, sed *irâ Jovis solicitati pravâ religione*, fulmine ictum cum domo conflagrasse; Livy, i. 31. The religious observances of Tullus here appear in the form of magic operations, by which, if properly performed, a supernatural being is pleased or even coerced: but which, if they are executed in an improper manner, fail of their effect, or even awaken his anger. With the destruction of Tullus and his entire family by lightning, compare the destruction of Aremulus and his entire family by water, κατακλυσθεὶς πανοίκιος ἀπόλλυται: Dion. Hal. i. 71. The account of the *Commentarii Numæ*, which Tullus is supposed to read, does not agree with the statement of Plutarch that his sacred books were buried with him; Plut. Num. 22.

(172) Dion. Hal. iii. 35.

---

(173) Duruy. Histoire des Romains, (Paris. 1843), vol. i. p. 98, designates the piacular sacrifices of the Gens Horatia, and the Tigillum Sororium, as 'irrécusables monuments de la vieille histoire de Rome.'

(174) See Grote's Hist. of Gr. vol. v. p. 29, and Penny Cyclopædia, art. Athos. The existence of this canal is, as is well known, ridiculed by Juvenal as a figment of Greek mendacity:—

Niebuhr considers the fact of the destruction of Alba, in the reign of Tullus Hostilius, to be historical. He nevertheless rejects the circumstances of the received account; for he conjectures either that Rome, in conjunction with the Latin towns, took Alba, and divided the conquered territory and people; or that Alba was destroyed by the Latins, not by Rome.(178) That

---

'Creditur olim
Velificatus Athos, et quicquid Græcia mendax
Audet in historiâ.'—x. 173-5.

Juvenal, who doubtless received as credible the narrative of the first five centuries of Rome, in the history of Livy, notwithstanding its want of external testimony, rejected this well-authenticated account of a nearly contemporary writer, because he considered it marvellous and improbable.

(175) See Mure, Hist. of Gr. Lit. vol. iv. p. 421. Layard, Nineveh and Babylon (London, 1853), p. 493.

(176) See above, in ch. ix. § 13, the remarks on the argument drawn by Dionysius from the memorials of Æneas.

(177) Rubino, Untersuchungen über Röm. Verfassung und Geschichte, p. 492, refers the Horatian story to monumental legends, and conjectures that the story of the three brothers may have arisen from Trigeminus, a cognomen of the Curiatii, Fast. Cap. ad 300 u.c.

(178) Hist. vol. i. p. 350-1. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 587-9.

the Romans, from the dawn of their historiography, believed in the former existence of a city of Alba, on a site marked by an extant temple of Vesta; and that they regarded it as the metropolis of Rome, may be considered as certain. It is possible that the connexion may have been real, and that its memory may have been preserved by annual rites performed under the direction of the Roman State. At the same time, it is difficult to affirm that the historical existence of a city near the Alban lake, said to have been demolished in the year 665 B.C., rests on a sure basis of evidence.(179) We must, in order to be satisfied on this point, suppose that its memory survived its downfall about four centuries and a half, before it passed from oral tradition into written history. With respect to the internal evidence, the wars of Tullus Hostilius present nothing which offends the laws of probability; but the entire story of the Horatii and Curiatii, including the murder of the sister,(180) has the air of

---

(179) The most ancient sea-fight of which Thucydides believed that a record existed, viz., one between the Corinthians and Corcyræans, is referred by him to the year 664 B.C. (i. 13.)

(180) It does not appear that there is any instance of the murder of a sister by a brother, in authentic history. It is possible that some cases may have occurred in Oriental palaces; but the sanguinary ostracism of Asiatic despotisms has usually been limited to brothers. Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, murdered the daughter of Cleopatra, Alexander's step-sister, in her mother's arms; this was an act of feminine vengeance; Alexander had contented himself with the murder of his step-brother Caranus, her other child. See Justin, ix. 7; xi. 2. The murder of a sister by a brother seems to be extremely rare, if not unknown, in the records of criminal courts.

From the following account (which I owe to the kindness of Major Graham, the Registrar General), it will be seen that triple births, though very rare, happen occasionally in a large population:—

Total, Triple, and Quadruple Births registered in England and Wales, in the years 1845 *and* 1846.

Years.	Total Births in England and Wales.	Triple Births.					Quadruple Births.			Proportion to the Total Births.	
		Total Triple Births.	All Males.	Two Males and one Female.	One Male and two Females.	All Females.	Total Quadruple Births.	All Males.	One Male and Three Females.	One Triplet in	One Quadruple in
1845	543,621	19	5	2	6	6	2	1	1	28,606	271,761
1846	572,625	30	10	10	7	3	1	1	...	19,088	572,625

romance; and the account of the death of Tullus by lightning is avowedly related as an example of the direct interposition of Jupiter.

§ 19 Upon the death of Tullus Hostilius, an interregnum occurred, and, the people, under the presidency of the interrex, and with the consent of the Senate, appointed Ancus Marcius king.(181) He is related to have begun his reign by reverting to the institutions and practice of his grandfather Numa; to have revived the national care for religious observances, and to have brought back the Romans from the warlike habits of the previous reign to a cultivation of the arts of peace. With this view, he caused the sacred institutes of Numa, as preserved in his private documents, to be written by the Pontifex Maximus upon whitened tablets, and exhibited in public.(182)

Ancus, however, had not, like Numa, the happiness of maintaining a perpetual peace. He is described as being of a middle character: less warlike than Romulus, but less pacific than Numa.(183) Having received provocation from the Latins, he determined to commence hostilities against them; and for this purpose he instituted the mode of declaring war, which continued in later times to be practised by the Feciales.(184) In this, however, as in other origins of legal institutions, the accounts differ; for Dionysius and Plutarch attribute the establishment of the Fecial ceremonies to Numa;(185) whereas Cicero represents Tullus Hostilius as the author of the forms of demanding redress, which Livy ascribes to Ancus.(186) In the Latin war, the towns of Politorium, Medullia, Tellenæ, and Ficana are reduced: Fidenæ also is taken by mines; afterwards there follow two Sabine wars, a Volscian war, and a war against the Veientes.(187) Ancus is further described as having fortified the Aventine, as well as the Janiculum on the northern bank of the Tiber; and as having been the author of the most ancient of the Roman bridges, called Pons Sublicius, which connected the latter region with the city. This bridge was considered sacred in later times; it was built exclusively of wood, and when repaired as a relic of antiquity, no iron was admitted into its construction.(188) It was likewise celebrated as being the bridge on which Horatius Cocles made his heroic defence in the war against Porsena.(189) Ancus is further described as the founder of Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber; and as the author of a ditch called the *Fossa Quiritium;* also as the builder of the earliest Roman prison.(190)

---

(181) As we have already seen, Ancus Marcius was the son of Pompilia, the daughter of Numa. Above, p. 453. According to Plutarch, Num. 21, all the writers agreed that Marcius, the son of Marcius the Sabine, a friend and councillor of Numa, was the husband of Pompilia, and the father of Ancus. Cicero, however, speaks of the father of Ancus as being unknown. 'Tunc Lælius: 'Laudandus etiam iste rex [Ancus]: sed obscura est historia Romana; siquidem istius regis matrem habemus, ignoramus patrem.' S: 'Ita est, inquit; *sed temporum illorum tantum fere regum illustrata sunt nomina.*' De Rep. ii. 18. Zonaras explains the name Ancus from the Greek: *ἦν δὲ τὴν χεῖρα οὐκ ἄρτιος· τὴν γὰρ ἀγκύλην πεπήρωτο, ὅθεν καὶ Ἄγκος ἐπώνυμον ἐσχήκει*; vii. 7.

(182) Livy, i. 32; Dion. Hal. iii. 36. Livy says that Numa had already given these ordinances in writing to Numa Marcius, the chief pontifex: 'Pontificem deinde Numam Marcium, Marci filium, ex patribus legit, eique sacra omnia exscripta exsignataque attribuit; quibus hostiis, quibus diebus, ad quæ templa sacra fierent, atque unde in eos sumtus pecunia erogaretur;' i. 20. See above, p. 142.

(183) Medium erat in Anco ingenium, et Numæ et Romuli memor: et, præterquam quod avi regno magis necessariam fuisse pacem credebat, quum in novo, tum feroci populo: etiam, quod illi contigisset otium, sine injuriâ id se haud facile habiturum, tentari patientiam, et tentatam contemni; temporaque esse Tullo regi aptiora quam Numæ; Livy. i. 32. So Zonaras says: *ἐπιεικὴς δὲ ὢν ἠναγκάσθη μεταβάλλεσθαι, καὶ πρὸς στρατείας ἐτράπετο*; vii. 7.

---

(184) Livy thus describes the origin of this ceremonial: Ut tamen, quoniam Numa in pace religiones instituisset, a se bellicæ ceremoniæ proderentur; nec gererentur solum, sed etiam indicerentur bella aliquo ritu; jus ab antiquâ gente Æquicolis, *quod nunc feciales habent*, descripsit, quo res repetuntur. He then details the antique forms at length, and adds: hoc tum modo ab Latinis repetitæ res, ac bellum indictum, *moremque eum posteri acceperunt;* i. 32. Livy speaks of the feciales as existing under Tullus, in connexion with the forms for making a treaty; i. 24. Servius, Æn. x. 14, says that Ancus Marcius sent to the Æquiculi, and received from them the jura fetialia, for the declaration of war. On Æn. vii. 695, he has the following explanation of the proper name Æqui Falisci: 'Justos autem dicit, quia populus Romanus missis decem viris ab ipsis jura fetialia collegit, et nonnulla supplementa duodecim tabularum accepit: nam ab Atheniensibus decem habuerant tabulas.' This note (which makes the fecial law subsequent to the ten tables) renders it probable that the story of its derivation from the Æquiculi, or Æqui, is merely an etymological legend founded on their supposed *equity*. Victor, de Vir. Ill. c. 5. says of Ancus: 'Jus fetiale, quo legati ad res repetundas uterentur, ab Æquiculis transtulit; quod primus fertur Rhesus excogitasse.' The meaning of the allusion to Rhesus is not apparent. Diod. viii. 34, alludes to the Roman custom of declaring war by throwing a spear into the enemy's country.

(185) ii. 74. Dionysius says that some writers represented Numa as borrowing the institution from the Æquicoli; whereas Cneius Gellius said that he derived it from the city of Ardea. See Krause, p. 208. Plutarch, Cam. 18, states that the mild and just Numa instituted the feciales.

(186) [Tullus Hostilius] constituit jus quo bella indicerentur; quod, per se justissime inventum, sanxit fetiali religione, ut omne bellum, quod denunciatum indictumque non esset, id injustum esse atque impium judicaretur. Cic. de Rep. ii. 17. See Dion. Hal. iii. 2-3; Diod. viii. 33.

(187) These wars are described by Dionysius, iii. 37—42. Livy only mentions the Latin war. He speaks, however, of the Silva Mæsia being taken from the Veientes; i. 33. The account of the capture of Fidenæ by mines, is in Dion. H. iii. 40. Schwegler. ib. p. 604, 606, thinks that the wars of Ancus with the Latin cities are in the main historical; but that the wars with the Fidenates, Sabines, Volscians, and Veientes, are the invention of historical writers. This distinction is purely arbitrary.

---

(188) *καὶ τὴν ξυλίνην γέφυραν, ἣν ἄνευ χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου θέμις ὑπ' αὐτῶν διακρατεῖσθαι τῶν ξύλων, ἐκεῖνος ἐπιθεῖναι τῷ Τιβέρει λέγεται, ἣν ἄχρι τοῦ παρόντος διαφυλάττουσιν, ἱερὰν εἶναι νομίζοντες. εἰ δέ τι πονήσειεν αὐτῆς μέρος, οἱ ἱεροφάνται θεραπεύουσι, θυσίας τινὰς ἐπιτελοῦντες ἅμα τῇ κατασκευῇ πατρίους;* Dion. Hal. iii. 45; compare v. 24, ix. 68. See also Livy, i. 33; Ovid, Fast. v. 622. Plutarch, Num. 9, connects the name *pontifices* with the care of the wooden bridge; the preservation of it being a religious duty. The absence of iron he attributes to the command of an oracle. Varro, L. L. v. 83, derives the name of the pontifices from the Pons Sublicius, because it had been originally built, and often repaired by them. This is a different origin for the bridge.

(189) Pliny, N. H. xxxvi. 23, attributes the absence of iron in this bridge to the difficulty of cutting it when defended by Horatius Cocles: 'Quod item in ponte Sublicio religiosum est. posteaquam Coclite Horatio defendente ægre revulsus est.' Dionysius, v. 24, Livy, ii. 10, and Victor de Vir. Ill. c. 11, mention the Sublician bridge on this occasion. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 181, 693. The absence of iron is likewise characteristic of the boat or ship of Æneas, which in late times was exhibited as a relic at Rome. See above, p. 322, note 100. The name *Sublicius* was derived from *Sublicæ*, the upright wooden posts on which the footway was laid. See Livy, i. 37.

(190) See Polyb. vi. 2; Dion. Hal. iii. 43; Livy, i. 33; Victor de Vir. Ill. c. 5. The accounts as to the Fossa Quiritium are not consistent. Festus, p. 254. Quiritium fossæ dicuntur, quibus Ancus Martius circumdedit urbem, quam secundum ostium Tiberis posuit, ex quo etiam Ostiam; et quia populi operâ eas fecerat, appellavit Quiritium. Livy, after speaking of the Janiculum and the Pons Sublicius, proceeds to say: 'Quiritium quoque fossa haud parvum munimentum a planioribus aditu locis, Anci regis opus est;' i. 33. He therefore seems to consider it as a fortification of part of Rome. These accounts differ as to the locality of the Fossa Quiritium, which Festus places at Ostia, and Livy at Rome, but they agree in making it the work of Ancus. On the other hand, Victor follows a wholly different track, for he makes it a name of the cloaca maxima, which was the work of Tarquinius Superbus: Foros in Circo et cloacam maximam fecit, ubi totius populi viribus usus est, unde illæ Fossæ Quiritium sunt dictæ; De Vir. Ill. c. 8. Compare Livy, i. 56; Dion. Hal. iv. 44. Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 353, conjectures that the Fossa Quiritium is the same as the modern Marrana—but the ancients them-

He is said to have made a division among the citizens of the lands taken by him in war;(191) thus imitating the measure adopted by Numa and Tullus Hostilius with respect to the lands which had been acquired by Romulus.(192) Livy likewise represents Ancus as granting the right of citizenship to a large body of Latins, and settling them in the city on and near the Aventine.(193) This statement is considered historical by Niebuhr, who supposes that the Latin settlers in question were the origin of the Roman plebs; and that Ancus was the founder of the plebeian order.(194) For such a hypothesis there does not

---

selves do not seem to have been certain as to its locality. With respect to the prison of Ancus, see Becker, vol. i. p. 262; Schwegler, ib. p. 607.

(191) Quosque agros ceperat, divisit; Cic. Rep. ii. 18.

(192) Ac primum agros, quos bello Romulus ceperat, [Numa] divisit viritim civibus, docuitque sine depopulatione atque prædâ posse eos colendis agris abundare commodis omnibus, amoremque eis otii et pacis injecit, quibus facillime justitia et fides convalescit, et quorum patrocinio maxime cultus agrorum perceptioque frugum defenditur; Cic. de Rep. ii. 14. Numa's division of lands is also described at length by Dion. Hal. ii. 62. With respect to the measure of Tullus, see Dion. Hal. iii. 1.

(193) Politorium, urbem Latinorum, vi cepit; *secutusque morem regum priorum*, qui rem Romanam auxerant hostibus in civitatem accipiendis, multitudinem omnem Romam traduxit; i. 33. The first body are placed on the Aventine, a second body between the Aventine and Palatine; ib. It is evident that Livy does not represent Ancus as the first king who introduced a body of settlers at Rome.

(194) Hist. vol. i. p. 354-5. Compare Schwegler, ib. p. 605. Ennius gave to Ancus the epithet of *good*:

'Postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancu' reliquit;'
Ap. Fest. in sos. p. 501;

which is repeated by Lucretius:

'Lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancu' reliquit,
Qui melior multis quam tu fuit, improbe, rebus.'
iii. 1038-9.

The latter verse being, as Wakefield remarks, an allusion to Iliad, xxi. 107. Niebuhr thinks that this epithet was bestowed upon Ancus in the old poems, by the plebeians, because he was the author of the assignment of public lands among them. Virgil indeed describes him as a king of popular tendencies:

'Quem juxta sequitur jactantior Ancus,
Nunc quoque jam nimium gaudens popularibus auris.'
Æn. vi. 816-7.

But this view of his character does not accord with the account of him in Dionysius and Livy. Heyne says: 'De Anco Marcio, quasi is favorem populi captaverit, adeoque superbior in patres fuerit, alios auctores habuisse Maronem necesse est, quam quos Livius et Dionysius ceterique sequuntur, qui ad nos pervenerunt.' The reading of a part of the MSS. in appear to be any foundation; no peculiar importance is attached to these Latin settlements by Livy: they are not mentioned by Dionysius, who describes the Latin war at some length; and the ancients know nothing of Ancus in the character which is attributed to him by Niebuhr. The plebeian order is treated by them as coeval with the very existence of the Roman state: thus Dionysius describes Romulus as dividing the people into patricians and plebeians,(195) while Cicero speaks of his distributing the plebeians, as clients, among the several nobles.(196)

Catull. xxxiv.—Romulique Antiquam, ut solita es bonâ Sospites ope gentem—is quite satisfactory; and the conjecture of Scaliger, *Ancique*. founded on *antique*, which is in some MSS. is highly improbable, although it is approved by Niebuhr, vol. i. n. 883.

(195) *ἐκάλει δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐν τῇ καταδεεστέρᾳ τύχῃ πληβείους, ὡς δ' ἂν Ἕλληνες εἴποιεν δημοτικούς, τοὺς δ' ἐν τῇ κρείττονι, πατέρας*; ii. 8. Compare Becker, ii. 1, p. 13. Above, p. 413.

(196) Et habuit [Romulus] plebem in clientelas principum descriptam; De Rep. ii. 9. Livy, i. 15, speaks of Romulus being 'multitudini gratior quam patribus,' and in c. 18, of Numa, 'neque se quisquam, nec factionis suæ alium, nec denique *patrum aut civium quemquam* præferre illi viro ausi.'

PART II.—THE REIGNS OF TARQUINIUS PRISCUS, SERVIUS TULLIUS, AND TARQUINIUS SUPERBUS.

§ 20 WE now approach the first point of contact between the histories of Greece and Rome. Demaratus, a member of the race of the Bacchiadæ, fled from Corinth at the time when the government of that noble clan was overthrown by Cypselus, and he settled at Tarquinii in Etruria. The commencement of the reign of Cypselus is fixed by the Greek chronologers at 665 B.C.,(1) which is coincident with the reign of Tullus Hostilius, and the fall of Alba, in Roman history. Here he marries an Etruscan wife, and has two sons, whom he names Aruns and Lucumo.(2) They likewise marry women of Tarquinii; and the elder dies, leaving his wife pregnant; Demaratus did not long survive his elder son, but he left all his great wealth to his younger son Lucumo. A posthumous son was afterwards born to Aruns, who, on account of his poverty, obtained from the Romans the name of Egerius. Lucumo, finding that the Tarquinian nobles did not admit him to the honours which he considered due to his wealth, removed to Rome, where he soon ingratiated himself with the king, senate, and people; the highest dignities, civil and military, were conferred upon him, and he became a man of great importance. As a mark of his complete naturalization in his newly-adopted country, he changed his Etruscan name of Lucumo into Lucius, and as a gentile name assumed that of his native city, so that he now became Lucius Tarquinius.(3) His hopes of a successful career at Rome were raised by a lucky omen which occurred when he was passing the Janiculum. An eagle flew down, carried away his cap, and afterwards replaced it on his head. His wife Tanaquil, whose Etruscan origin had caused her to know the secrets of divination, immediately predicted that he would become king of Rome.(4)

---

(1) See Clinton, ad ann. Archias, the founder of Syracuse, in 734 B.C. is also said to have been a Bacchiad exile; see Plutarch, Narr. Amat. c. 2; Diod. viii. 10; but another version of the story represents him as having been expelled from Corinth with the other Bacchiadæ (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 1212); which would transfer the foundation of Syracuse to 665 B.C. The foundation legend of Syracuse seems therefore to be in hopeless confusion. Chersicrates, the founder of Corcyra, is connected with the same event. See Raoul-Rochette, Col. Grecques, vol. iii. p. 178—185; Müller, Dor. i. 6, § 7 and 8; Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. iii. p. 3, 481.

(2) Concerning Lucumo and Aruns as Etruscan proper names, see Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 363, 405, 409. Müller thinks that Lucumo was not really an Etruscan proper name, but designated a certain social rank, or was a title of office.

Ancus Marcius left two sons just rising to manhood.(5) L. Tarquinius had been appointed their guardian; and upon the death of Ancus, he sends them out of the way, and procures his own election by the people as king; the usual forms of an interregnum having been observed.(6) He is represented by Dionysius as having been engaged, during a large part of his reign, in great wars against the powerful nations of the Latins, Sabines, and Etruscans. In these wars—which are described with great detail—he defeats his enemies; but after he has reduced the Etruscans to subjection, he treats them with the most romantic magnanimity, exacting from them nothing more than an acknowledgment of his nominal suzerainty.(7) This acknowledgment is described as being made by a delivery to Tarquin of the insignia of the Etruscan kings; a golden crown, an ivory chair, an embroidered toga, and other marks of honour, together with the twelve fasces. Tarquin, however, would not accept these emblems of power until he had obtained the consent of the Senate and people to his use of them.(8) According to some accounts, these insignia of empire, and particularly the fasces, were introduced by Romulus:(9) according to others, their introduction was due to Tullus Hostilius, who is likewise reported to have applied to the people for permission to use them.(10)

---

(3) Dion. Hal. iii. 39, 41, 46-8, who narrates the history of Tarquin as he found it ἐν ταῖς ἐπιχωρίαις γραφαῖς, in the writings of the Roman historians (cf. c. 69). See also iv. 6; Livy, i. 34; Polyb. vi. 2; Diod. viii. 41; Dio Cassius, ix. 1; Strabo, v. 2, § 2; Pliny, N. H. xxxv. 5; Zonaras, vii. 8. Livy and Strabo both say that he assumed the names of Lucius Tarquinius Priscus; but the latter name must have been added in order to distinguish him from the other king Tarquin. See Dion. Hal. iv. 41.

(4) Dion. Hal. iii. 48; Livy, i. 34. Cicero, Leg. i. 1, treats the story of the eagle and the cap of Tarquin as fabulous. He puts it on the same footing as the colloquies of Numa with Egeria. A story was told of Augustus, that when he was a boy, and residing in the country, an eagle stooped from its flight, took a loaf of bread out of his hands, soared up, but descended again, and restored it to him; Dio Cass. xlv. 2. A kite is also said to have dropped a branch of laurel upon one of Cæsar's companions in the Forum, ib. xli. 39, and an eagle to have thrown a white bird, bearing a sprig of bay, into Livia's lap; ib. xlviii. 52.

(5) Dion. Hal. iii. 43. Tanaquil, under the name of Gaia Cæcilia, had a statue in the temple of Sancus. This statue possessed certain magical and marvellous powers. She was celebrated as a spinner of wool, and was supposed on account of her possession of that virtue of a housewife, to exercise some influence over brides: see Pliny, N. H. viii. 74: Plut. Quæst. Rom. 30; Festus, in Gaia Cæcilia, p. 95, in præbia, p. 238. Plutarch does not identify Gaia Cæcilia with Tanaquil, but makes her the wife of one of the sons of Tarquin. He does not specify which of the kings he means: but according to the common accounts, the two sons of Tarquinius Priscus marry the two daughters of Servius, and the three sons of Tarquinius Superbus are unmarried. See above, p. 108, n. 32.

(6) Livy, i. 34-5; Dion. Hal. iii. 46-49.

---

(7) Dion. Hal. iii. 49-66. Zonaras, vii. 8, likewise attributes the introduction of the royal insignia to Tarquin the elder. Lydus, de Mag. i. 7, says that the lictors and other insignia were introduced by Romulus: but that Tarquinius Priscus, having conquered the Sabines and Etruscans, added twelve javelins and flags to the royal ensigns. In the proem, however, he states that Numa introduced these insignia from Etruria.

(8) Dion. Hal. iii. 61-2. Strabo, v. 2, § 2, describes the triumphal and consular insignia as having been introduced into Rome from Tarquinii, apparently in the time of Tarquinius Priscus. Florus gives the same account: 'Duodecim Tusciæ populos frequentibus armis subegit. Inde fasces, trabeæ, curules, annuli, phaleræ, paludamenta, prætextæ; inde, quod aureo curru, quatuor equis triumphatur; togæ pictæ, tunicæque palmatæ; omnia decora et insignia, quibus imperii dignitas eminet;' i. 5. Silius attributes them generally to the Etruscan nation:

Bissenos hæc prima dedit procedere fasces,
Et junxit totidem tacito terrore secures.
Hæc altas eboris decoravit honore curules,
Et princeps Tyrio vestem prætexuit ostro;
Hæc eadem pugnas accendere protulit ære.
viii. 486–90.

Diod. v. 40, likewise says that the Etruscans originated the lictors, the ivory chair, and the toga prætexta: which the Romans introduced, with improvements, into their constitution. Cæsar, in Sallust, Cat. 51, says that the Romans borrowed their arms and armour from the Samnites, and the insignia of their magistrates from the Etruscans.

(9) Quæ [jura] ita sancta generi hominum agresti fore ratus, si se ipse venerabilem insignibus imperii fecisset. quum cetero habitu se augustiorem, tum maxime lictoribus duodecim sumtis fecit; Livy, i. 8 of Romulus. Plutarch, Rom. 26, gives the same account.

(10) Et ut advertatis animum. quam sapienter jam reges hoc nostri

The institution of the *bulla aurea* and the *prætexta*, as ornaments for patrician youths, is also referred to the Sabine war: Tarquin is described as having commended his son, a boy twelve years old, in a speech delivered in a public assembly, and as having conferred upon him these decorations, for having killed an enemy in the field.(11)

Tarquin appears as a successful military commander in the history of Dionysius, and his wars are described in great detail: that with the Etruscans is stated to have lasted nine, that with the Sabines, five years.(12) The Latin and Sabine wars are mentioned by Livy, but not the Etruscan; both historians describe the capture of Collatia, and the appointment of Aruns Tarquinius Egerius, the king's nephew, as governor of the town; whose descendants, from this circumstance, took the

---

viderint, tribuenda quædam esse populo (multa enim nobis de eo genere dicenda sunt), ne insignibus quidem regiis Tullus, nisi jussu populi, est ausus uti. Nam ut sibi duodecim lictores cum fascibus anteire liceret. . . . [the rest of the passage is lost]; Cic. Rep. ii. 17. Purpuræ usum Romæ semper fuisse video, sed Romulo in trabeâ. Nam togâ prætextâ et latiore clavo Tullum Hostilium a regibus primum usum, Etruscis devictis satis constat; Plin. N. H. ix. 63. Tullus Hostilius, Hosti filius, rex Romanorum tertius, debellatis Etruscis, sellam curulem, lictoresque, et togam pictam atque prætextam, quæ insignia magistratuum Etruscorum erant, primus ut Romæ haberentur instituit; Mac. Saturn. i. 6. On the insignia of the kings, see Becker, ii. 1. p. 336; and on their derivation from the Etruscans, Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 369—72. Müller says that lictors with bundles of rods, but without the axe, occur on Etruscan monuments. Among the honours granted to Cæsar was the privilege of wearing the dress formerly worn by the kings; Dio Cass. xliv. 6.

(11) Tarquinius Priscus—de Sabinis egit triumphum: quo bello filium suum, annos quatuordecim natum, quod hostem manu percusserat, et pro concione laudavit et bullâ aureâ prætextâque donavit, insigniens puerum ultra annos fortem præmiis virilitatis et honoris. Nam sicut prætexta magistratuum, ita bulla gestamen erat triumphantium, quam in triumpho præ se gerebant, inclusis intra eam remediis, quæ crederent adversus invidiam valentissima. Hinc deductus mos, ut prætexta et bulla in usum puerorum nobilium usurparentur; Macrob. Saturn. i. 6. Macrobius proceeds to give another explanation of the institution of the same custom by the same king. Victor, de Vir. Ill. c. 6, also says of Tarquinius Priscus: Filium xiii. annorum, quod in prælio hostem percussisset, prætextâ bullâque donavit; unde hæc ingenuorum puerorum insignia esse cœperunt. Pliny, N. H. xxxiii. 4, has a similar account of the bulla. The same origin for the bulla is likewise given by Plutarch, Quæst. Rom. 101, referring it to a war with the Latins and Etruscans. He mentions however other conjectural origins for the custom.

(12) iii. 62-65. He lived four years after the Sabine war; ib. 69.

additional name of Collatinus.(13) Cicero, on the other hand, while he recognises the Sabine war, knows nothing of the Latin and Etruscan wars; and adds that he subdued the numerous and brave nation of the Æqui.(14)

§ 21 Other acts are assigned to the elder Tarquin—some of a constructive, others of a political character. He is said to have adorned the Forum, to have formed the Circus Maximus, and instituted the Ludi Romani, to have built a stone wall round the city, to have constructed the Cloacæ, and to have laid the foundation of the temple of Capitoline Jupiter.(15) The foundation legend of this temple is thus related by Dionysius, on the authority, as he states, of all the native historians.(16) When Tarquin was about to found the temple, he consulted the augurs as to the choice of a site. They indicated the Tarpeian hill, as the Capitoline was then called. This hill was however so closely beset with altars of different gods, that it was impossible to find an open space upon it sufficient for the purpose. The augurs therefore took measures for ascertaining the will of the several gods as to the removal of their altars; and all the gods consented, except Terminus and Juventas.(17) The altars of these two deities remained therefore untouched, and were included in the circuit of the new temple. Hence the augurs perceived that the boundaries of the Roman state would never be infringed, nor its vigour impaired; 'and both these auguries,' Dionysius adds, 'remain true up to my time, being not less than the twenty-fourth generation.'(18)

---

(13) Dion. Hal. iii. 50; Livy, i. 38. Livy sets out on this occasion the ancient formula of *deditio*, which he says that Egerius was reported to have used in the case of Collatia. Like other ancient formulas, recited by Livy, it was doubtless introduced into the early history, in order to give it an authoritative origin. Dionysius describes Collatia as a Latin, whereas Livy makes it a Sabine town. This incident seems to be introduced in order to connect with the story of Tarquinius Superbus; for Tarquinius Collatinus, the husband of Lucretia, is supposed to be residing at Collatia; and the descendants of Tarquinius Egerius are stated by Dionysius to have all borne the appellation of Collatinus. Servius follows a wholly different story; he says that Tarquinius founded Collatia, and built it from money exacted from the people (ex collatâ pecuniâ), whence its name was derived. Æn. vi. 773.

(14) De Rep. ii. 20. Strabo, v. 3, § 4, likewise mentions the destruction of the towns of the Æqui by Tarquinius Priscus.

(15) Dion. Hal. iii. 67-9; Livy, i, 36, 38; Victor de Vir. Ill. c. 6.

(16) *ἄξιον δὲ καὶ τὰ πρὸ τῆς κατασκευῆς αὐτοῦ γενόμενα διελθεῖν, ἃ παραδεδώκασιν ἅπαντες οἱ τὰς ἐπιχωρίους συναγάγοντες ἱστορίας*; Dion. Hal. iii. 69.

(17) *οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι θεοί τε καὶ δαίμονες ἐπίτρεψαν αὐτοῖς εἰς ἕτερα χωρία τοὺς βωμοὺς μεταφέρειν· οἱ δὲ τοῦ Τέρμονος καὶ τῆς Νεότητος πολλὰ παραιτουμένοις τοῖς μάντεσι καὶ λιπαροῦσιν οὐκ ἐπείσθησαν, οὐδ᾽ ἠνέσχοντο παραχωρῆσαι τῶν τόπων*; ib. The deseration (exauguratio) of the altars is placed by Livy under Tarquinius Superbus; i. 55. In this passage he limits it to the altar of Terminus, but in v. 54, he mentions both Terminus and

An increase of the numbers of the Senate is likewise one of his measures. Livy says that, from a desire to gain popularity, he added 100 members to the Senate, who were called *patres minorum gentium*, and were chosen from his own partisans.(19) A similar account is given by Dionysius ;(20) though the former

---

Juventas. Cato, ap. Fest. in nequitum, mentions only the fane of Terminus (Krause, p. 106). Ovid, Fast. ii. 667—70, likewise tells the story with respect to Terminus. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 397.

(18) Dionysius says that Tarquin the elder vowed the temple in the Sabine war, and levelled the ground for it (iii. 69); that Tarquinius Superbus built the foundations—on which occasion the head of a man, newly killed, was found, and the name of the hill was changed from Tarpeian to Capitoline (iv. 59); and that it was completed in the third year of the commonwealth (v. 35). According to Livy, the temple was vowed in the Sabine war, and its foundations laid by Tarquinius Priscus; i. 58: the desecration of all the altars, with the exception of that of Terminus, and the finding of the head, occurred in the time of Tarquinius Superbus, who completed the temple; i. 55-6: and the dedication of it took place in the first year of the Republic; ii. 8. Tacitus states that the temple was vowed by Tarquinius Priscus, in the Sabine war, who laid its foundations; that the building was completed by Servius Tullius and Tarquinius Superbus; and that it was dedicated in the second consulship of Horatius Pulvillus (the third year of the Republic); Hist. iii. 72. Pliny says that Tarquinius Priscus ordered a statue of Jupiter, in order that it might be dedicated in the Capitol; xxxv. 45; which seems to imply that he completed the temple. Cicero, Rep. ii. 20, merely mentions the vow for the temple having been made by Tarquinius Priscus. See Becker, vol. i. p. 396. Valerius Antias stated that Tarquin began the construction of the Capitol from the spoils of Apiolæ: 'Præterea auctor est Antias oppidum Latinorum Apiolas captum a L. Tarquinio rege, ex cujus prædâ Capitolium is inchoaverit;' Plin. N. H. iii. 9. This notice appears to refer to Tarquinius Priscus; for the capture of Apiolæ is attributed to him by Dionysius; iii. 49, and Strabo, v. 3, § 4. Dionysius calls Apiolæ a considerable city, and says that all its population and property were sold by the conquerors.

(19) Nec minus regni sui firmandi, quam augendæ reipublicæ memor, centum in patres legit; qui deinde minorum gentium sunt appellati; factio haud dubia regis, cujus beneficio in curiam venerant; i. 35. A similar account is given by Victor, de Vir. Ill. c. 6. Cicero says that he doubled the original number of the senators, and called the original ones patres majorum gentium, and the new ones, patres minorum gentium; Rep. ii. 20.

(20) iii. 71. The early history of Attus Navius, and the explanation of his great proficiency in divination, is given by Dionysius; ib. c. 70.

considers the existing Senate to consist of 100, the latter of 200 members. Others however appear to ascribe this increase of the Senate to Servius Tullus, or to Brutus.(21) He is further described as desirous of adding three new equestrian centuries to the tribes or centuries of Ramnes, Titienses, and Luceres; but as being prevented by the opposition of Attius Navius, the augur; who, in proof of his divining power, performed the celebrated marvel of cutting the whetstone with the razor. The statue of Attus, with the head covered, was afterwards shown in the comitium, on the spot where the act was done; the whetstone was also supposed to have been buried in the same place.(22) The result of the interference is, that Tarquin establishes six equestrian centuries in the form in which they existed in later times.(23)

§ 22 The death of Tarquin is described as brought about by the sons of Ancus Marcius. They considered themselves wronged by the election of Tarquin, a foreigner, and scarcely an Italian, in preference to themselves;(24) and they accused him of being privy to the death of Attus Navius, who had disappeared without any apparent cause. He defends himself in public against this charge, and is supported by Servius Tullius, who had married one of his daughters; the popular audience is satisfied of his innocence. The sons of Ancus remain quiet for three years; at the end of which time they succeed in putting the king to death by a fictitious quarrel between two countrymen, who obtain admission into his presence, with their rustic instruments, on pretence of recurring to his jurisdiction.(25) The stratagem said to have been employed is somewhat similar to that by which Jason of Pheræ was assassinated.(26)

---

(21) Tacitus, Ann. xi. 25, says that the patres majorum gentium were named by Romulus, and those minorum gentium by Brutus. Servius, Æn. i. 426, speaks of senators being chosen into the Senate from the plebs by Servius Tullius.

(22) Livy, i. 36; Dion. Hal. iii. 71; Zonaras, vii. 8. Cic. de Div. i. 17, says that both the razor and the whetstone were buried in the Comitium, and a puteal placed over them. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 291.

(23) Posteriores modo sub iisdem nominibus, qui additi erant, appellati sunt: *quas nunc, quia geminatæ sunt, sex vocant centurias;* Livy, i. 36. Deinde equitatum ad hunc morem constituit, *qui usque adhuc est retentus:* nec potuit Titiensium et Ramnensium et Lucerum mutare, cum cuperet, nomina, quod auctor ei summâ augur gloriâ Attus Navius non erat. . . . Sed tamen prioribus equitum partibus secundis additis mille ac ducentos fecit equites, numerumque duplicavit; Cic. Rep. ii. 20. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 892.

(24) Livy says: Tum Anci filii duo etsi antea semper pro indignissimo habuerant, se *patrio regno* tutoris fraude pulsos, regnare Romæ advenam, non modo civicæ, sed ne Italicæ quidem stirpis; i. 40. In like manner Canuleius the tribune is represented as saying: 'L. deinde Tarquinium, non Romanæ modo, sed ne Italicæ quidem gentis, Damarati Corinthii filium, incolam ab Tarquiniis, *viris liberis Anci*, regem factum;' iv. 3.

§ 23 The reign of Tarquinius Priscus is the commencement of the second portion of the kingly period.(27) He, his son-in-law, Servius Tullus, and his son, Tarquinius Superbus, close the line of kings. His reign likewise (as we have already remarked) is the first point of contact with Grecian history, since the foundation of the city. Nevertheless, it presents no new feature with respect to its historical attestation. No event in it can be traced to any contemporary source—and although it is nearer the time of written history than the reigns of Romulus and Numa, still the interval is so wide, that oral tradition cannot be considered as a safe depository for its occurrences. The story of the flight of Demaratus from Corinth to Tarquinii, and of the removal of his son Lucumo to Rome, is consistent with the chronologies of both nations. It is not, like the story of Numa and Pythagoras, a chronological absurdity. The commencement of the reign of Cypselus at Corinth (which is described as the cause of the flight of Demaratus) is placed at 655 B.C.; and the reign of Ancus is said to have lasted from 641 to 617 B.C.; so that the son of Demaratus, born at Tarquinii, might have become eminent at Rome during that king's lifetime.(28)

---

(25) Dion. Hal. iii. 72-3; Livy, i. 40; Zon. vii. 8.

(26) Xen. Hellen. vi. 4, § 31. Compare Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. x. p. 268.

(27) Schwegler, ib. p. 690, remarks that the epoch of the first four kings differs politically from that of the last three.

(28) If however Lucumo, the son of Demaratus, went to Rome in the first year of Ancus, according to Cn. Gellius, or even the eighth year, according to Licinius Macer (Dion. Hal. iv. 6), the dates would be inconsistent. For Demaratus is represented as marrying *after* his migration to Tarquinii, and if he did not settle there till 655 B.C., his eldest son could

Nevertheless, it is to be remembered that the period of the Bacchiadæ at Corinth is, notwithstanding the comparative antiquity of authentic Grecian history, enveloped in clouds—and the few events which are referred to it, such as the foundation legend of Syracuse, seem to be fabulous. Even the interesting story told in Herodotus, of the ten Bacchiadæ coming to kill the infant Cypselus, and his subsequent concealment in a chest, is nothing but an etymological legend explanatory of his name (from κυψέλη, a chest).(29)

The wars of Tarquinius Priscus are described at considerable length by Dionysius; but although he is acquainted with some of their minutest details, and narrates them as if he had a series of official despatches before him,(30) other writers omit all mention of the majority of them, and appear scarcely to have heard of their occurrence. The stories again, which connect the name of Tarquin with certain monuments and public works, such as the statue of Attus Navius, are liable to the same suspicion of a legendary origin, which we have found in other similar accounts.

---

not have removed to Rome so soon as 641, or even 633 B.C. Dionysius, ib. reckons that Lucumo could not have been less than twenty-five years old when he settled at Rome; so that his removal could not have taken place before 630 B.C.

(29) Herod. v. 92, with Paus. v. 17, § 5. Compare Müller, Dor. i. 8, § 3; Plass, Tyrannis, vol. i. p. 148—52; Grote, vol. ii. p. 409; vol. iii. p. 2. The word κυψέλη is used in this sense by Aristophanes. Pliny says that Euchir and Eugrammus accompanied Demaratus from Corinth, and introduced the art of pottery into Italy; N. H. xxxv. 43: but Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 374, and Müller, Etrusker, vol. ii. p. 260, considers these names as fictitious. Cornelius Nepos reported that Demaratus was also accompanied by a Corinthian painter named Cleophautus; Plin. ib. i. 5. Tacitus Ann. xi. 14, says that the Etruscans learnt the use of letters from Demaratus of Corinth, and the Aborigines from Evander. This notice treats Demaratus as a mythical originator. According to Strabo, viii. 6, § 20, Demaratus, having been driven from Corinth by the political dissensions, carried so much wealth with him to Tuscany, that he became the ruler of the city which received him. Boeckh, Metrologische Untersuchungen, p. 208, appears to regard the migration of Demaratus to Tarquinii as historical. Müller, ib. vol. i. p. 120, holds that the story of the migration of Demaratus from Corinth to Tarquinii, and the Roman story of L. Tarquinius, were originally quite unconnected.

(30) 'Of the wars ascribed to L. Tarquinius, Dionysius, *adopting the forgeries of very recent annalists*, has given an intolerable newspaper account;' Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 358. By 'very recent annalists,' Niebuhr must mean historians subsequent to Fabius and Cato.

They moreover fluctuate between him and other kings, as in the legend of the foundation of the temple of Capitoline Jupiter.(31) His alleged introduction of the fasces and other royal insignia from Etruria, appears in an equally unsteady light. Even if the narrative of his reign were better attested, many circumstances in it would raise a doubt of its credibility: the story of the eagle flying away with his cap, and the cutting of the whetstone by Attus Navius, are purely marvellous; the manner of his introduction into Rome, and of his election to the royal dignity, is improbable, and his triumphant wars against the Latins, Sabines, and Etruscans, without a single important reverse, lie beyond the limits of credibility.

§ 24 If the Roman history during the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, and even the Corinthian history during the rule of the Bacchiadæ and of Cypselus, is of doubtful authority, from the want of contemporary registration,(32) still less can we suppose that any authentic accounts of the national migrations of the Gauls, beyond the Alps, at this period, could have been preserved. Nevertheless, Livy gives a description of a great movement of Celtic tribes, under two brothers Bellovesus and Sigovesus, which he states to have occurred in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus. The detachment under Sigovesus is said to have settled in the Hercynian forest, while that under Bellovesus marched to the country of the Tricastini (which lay between the Drôme and the Isère). Here they heard of the Phocæans, who became the colonists of Massilia, being attacked by the Salyes, a Ligurian tribe; and having afforded them some assistance, they crossed the Alps by the Saltus Taurinus, or Mont Genèvre, defeated the Etruscans on the Ticinus, and afterwards founded Mediolanum.(33) Other writers however place the first passage of the Gauls over the Alps at subsequent periods—and even only a short time before the burning of Rome.(34) Moreover, the foundation of Massilia, with which the story of Bellovesus is connected, is uncertain in its chronology; it has two dates, one of which indeed coincides with the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, but the other is about fifty years later.(35)

---

(31) Niebuhr remarks that 'in most instances the legends fluctuate in ascribing a work or an exploit, some to him, some to his son;' ib. p. 361.

(32) Fenestella, a writer of the Augustan age, stated that the olive was not known in Italy, Spain, and Africa, in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, in the year of the city 173 (580 B.C.); Pliny, N. H. xv. 1. How Fenestella obtained this information does not appear.

(33) Livy, v. 34. He adds that soon afterwards a body of Cenomani, assisted by Bellovesus, crossed the Alps by the same pass, and settled in

---

the region where Brixia and Verona afterwards stood. Concerning the country of the Tricastini, see Ukert, Geogr. der Griechen und Römer, ii. 2, p. 384, 594. Livy's account of the Gallic migrations in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus is discredited by Wickham and Cramer, Dissertation on the Passage of Hannibal over the Alps, p. 24—8, ed. 2.

(34) Diodorus, xiv. 113. Appian, Rom. Hist. iv. exc. 2, and Justin, xxiv. 4, represent the Gauls of Northern Italy as crossing the Alps a short time before the Gallic capture of Rome. Diodorus fixes the time at the siege of Rhegium by Dionysius, which, according to our own chronology, is posterior to the burning of Rome, viz., 388 B.C. Plutarch, Cam. 15-6, says that the Gauls crossed the Alps some indefinite time before the capture of Rome; but he makes no mention of the age of Tarquinius Priscus. Polybius, ii. 17-8, gives an account of the order in which the Gallic tribes crossed the Alps, and settled in Italy; and he then adds that 'after some time,' they marched upon Rome (μετά τινα χρόνον); but he does not appear to consider the interval as very long. Livy himself, in v. 17 and 37, seems to forget his own story of the Gauls having crossed the Alps in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus: see Crevier's note on the former passage, and Niebuhr, Hist. vol. ii. p. 517. Cornelius Nepos stated that the opulent town of Melpum was destroyed by the Insubres, Boii, and Senones, on the very day on which Veii was taken by Camillus (Plin. N. H. iii. 21). It is difficult to judge how far this statement is to be relied on: but, assuming it to be substantially true, the remark of Niebuhr is just, that it can scarcely be reconciled with the supposition that this country had, since the age of Tarquinius Priscus, been in the occupation of the Gauls; ib. p. 517.

(35) Timæus placed the foundation of Massilia in 600 B.C. (Fragm. 40 ed. Didot.) Justin, xliii. 3, likewise says that it was founded in the time of Tarquin by the Phocæans. On the other hand, Isocrat. Archidam. § 94, and Pausan. x. 8, § 6, state that Massilia was colonized by the Phocæans, after they were expelled from their town by Harpagus—about 544 B.C. Hyginus, ap. Gell. N. A. x 16, says that the Phocæans expelled by Harpagus founded, some Velia, some Massilia. A similar account is given by Ammian. Marcellin. xv. 9. Antiochus, an early and trustworthy authority, stated that when Phocæa was taken by Harpagus, those who escaped sailed first to Corsica and Massilia with Creontiades, but being repulsed, founded Elea; Strabo, vi. i. § 1. Concerning the foundation of Elea by the Phocæans, see Herod. i. 167. Solinus, ii. 52, confounds the early and late date for the foundation of Massilia. Aristotle, Fragm. 238, Didot., supposes Massilia to have been founded before the time of Harpagus. Thucyd. i. 13, mentions that the Phocæans, founding Massilia, defeated the Carthaginians at sea: if this expression refers to the sea-fight described in Herod. i. 166, Thucydides must suppose the colonization of Massilia to have been *subsequent* to Harpagus. Compare Raoul-Rochette, Hist. des Col. Grecques, vol. iii. p. 408—13; Clinton, F. H. ad ann. 600. Raoul-Rochette supposes that Massilia was founded by *several* Phocæan expeditions: 'Il nous parait évident que Marseille fut fondée à plusieurs reprises,

The foundation legend of Massilia likewise represents the first colonists as having been hospitably entertained by the king of the native tribe; and does not agree with Livy's account of their being attacked on their first landing.(36) The Cisalpine Gauls were a rude and illiterate people,(37) and it is highly improbable that they could have preserved, either in writing or orally, any authentic account of their migration into Italy in the time of Tarquin the elder, 616—579 B.C.: nor do we know of any other means by which an accurate knowledge of such an event could have reached the subsequent Greek and Roman historians. Independently, therefore, of its inconsistency with other historical accounts, and of its internal improbabilities,(38) it is unsupported by such external attestation as entitles it to our belief.(39)

---

ou plutôt qu'elle reçut en des temps divers des colonies phocéennes;' ib. p. 408. This contrivance is similar to the supposition of *two* persons named Æneas, Romulus, &c. The foundation legends of Aristotle, in his *Μασσαλιωτῶν πολιτεία* (Fragm. 239), and of Justin, xliii. 3, are similar, though they differ in some material points. In Aristotle the Phocæan who marries the king's daughter is a merchant named Euxenus, and he becomes the father of Protus. In Justin, Protis, one of the leaders of the expedition, himself marries her. Both are evidently genealogical legends, serving to explain the origin of the family of Protiadæ, which was still extant in the time of Aristotle: *καὶ ἔστι γένος ἐν Μασσαλίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρώπου μέχρι νῦν Πρωτιάδαι καλούμενον.* Protus, the founder of Massilia, is called the favourite of the Celts on the Rhone, by Plut. Solon. 2.

(36) See the passages of Aristotle and Justin last quoted, and compare Niebuhr, ib. p. 518.

(37) Polybius describes their mode of life as quite barbarous: *διὰ γὰρ τὸ στιβαδοκοιτεῖν καὶ κρεοφαγεῖν, ἔτι δὲ μηδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν τὰ πολεμικὰ καὶ τὰ κατὰ γεωργίαν ἀσκεῖν, ἁπλοῦς εἶχον τοὺς βίους, οὔτ' ἐπιστήμης ἄλλης οὔτε τέχνης παρ' αὐτοῖς τὸ παράπαν γινωσκομένης*; ii. 17. Compare Justin's account of the barbarism of the Gauls among whom the Massaliots settled; xliii. 4. Seneca, Consol. ad Helv. 8, likewise speaks of the Phocæans who founded Massilia settling among the 'truces et inconditi Galliæ populi.'

(38) Some of these are well explained by Wickham and Cramer in their Dissertation on the passage of Hannibal over the Alps; p. 24-8 (ed. 2.) 'Though the account (they say) of these transactions is given with sufficient detail of circumstance, we discover upon examination many points which tend to render the whole confused, and difficult to be explained or reconciled with the true principles of geography . . . The whole of this account presents difficulties so apparent and obvious, as to throw no small doubt on the accuracy of Livy's researches into these facts.' It may however be doubted whether any amount of research would have enabled Livy to arrive at a true account.

(39) The account of Livy is rejected by Niebuhr; ib. p. 517—9. Müller, however, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 147—54, treats it as authentic. Compare Amedée Thierry, Histoire des Gaulois, vol. i. p. 39-44.

§ 25 The story of the birth of Servius Tullius, the next king, has two versions—one marvellous, and probably antique; the latter, modernized, and reduced to a standard of probability. According to the former, Ocresia, a slave in the household of Tarquin, beheld a divine appearance on the hearth, and afterwards became pregnant by the god: the child that was afterwards born, and was named Servius, from her servile condition, was seen by her during its sleep with its head surrounded by flames; on awaking it, she perceived that the flames were extinguished. According to the other version, Tullius, of the royal house of Corniculum, is slain in the capture of the city. His beautiful wife, Ocresia, is carried away prisoner by Tarquin, who gives her as a handmaid to his queen. She bears in captivity a posthumous son to her husband, who is called Servius, from his mother's condition, and Tullius from his father.(40) According to another account, Servius Tullius was a slave of Etruscan origin.(41)

---

(40) Dion. Hal. iv. 1-2; Livy, i. 39; Plut. de Fort. Rom. 10. The two historians prefer the rationalized version. Dionysius states that he found the marvellous version in many Roman histories, but he seems to doubt whether his repetition of it will be acceptable to the gods and heroes: φέρεται δέ τις ἐν ταῖς ἐπιχωρίοις ἀναγραφαῖς ἕτερος ὑπὲρ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ λόγος, ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐξαίρων τὰ περὶ αὐτόν, ὃν ἐν πολλαῖς Ῥωμαϊκαῖς ἱστορίαις εὕρομεν, εἰ θεοῖς τε καὶ δαίμοσι λέγεσθαι φίλος, τοιοῦτός τις, c. 2. Compare a similar expression of reluctance to relate subjects of religious mystery, in i. 67. In iv. 40, Dionysius remarks: ἡ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ μυθικὴ καὶ ἄπιστος ὑπόληψις ἀληθὴς εἶναι ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἐπιστεύθη.

Zonaras, vii. 9, and Victor de Vir. Ill. c. 7, give the rationalized version of his birth—but mention the prodigy of the flame round his head. Cicero says that he was the son of a client of the king, and of a Tarquinian slave: quem ferunt ex servâ Tarquiniensi natum, cum esset ex quodam regis cliente conceptus, Rep. ii. 21: Goettling, Röm. Staatsverf. p. 231, conjectures *servâ Tarquinii*. The emperor Claudius, in his speech preserved at Lyons, says that, according to the Roman writers, Servius was the son of Ocresia, a captive woman: Servius Tullius, si nostros sequimur, captivâ natus Ocresiâ. Florus, i. 6, mentions his servile origin, and the prodigy of the flame. Ovid, as is natural, adopts the marvellous version of the story.

Namque pater Tulli Vulcanus, Ocresia mater
  Præsignis facie Corniculana fuit.
Hanc secum Tanaquil sacris de more peractis
  Jussit in ornatum fundere vina focum.
Hic inter cineres obsceni forma virilis
  Aut fuit, aut visa est; sed fuit illa magis.
Jussa loco captiva sedet. Conceptus ab illâ
  Servius a cœlo semina gentis habet.
Signa dedit genitor tunc, cum caput igne corusco
  Contigit, inque comis flammeus arsit apex.
Fast. vi. 621—30.

According to both versions of the story, Servius is brought up in the palace, and ingratiates himself with the king, who gives him his daughter in marriage, and employs him in civil and military affairs.(42) When Tarquin has received his death-wound from the assassins employed by the sons of Ancus, Tanaquil is described as shutting the doors of the palace, and concealing his death. She thus affords time for Servius to assume the regal powers, which he at first exercises as the deputy of the king, and afterwards as guardian of his young children. No interrex is appointed, nor does Servius obtain a vote of the people in his favour, according to the proper constitutional forms. He acquires the royal office as son-in-law of

---

The prodigy of the flame round the head of Servius was peculiarly celebrated. Caput arsisse Servio Tullio dormienti, quæ historia non prodidit? Cic. de Div. i. 53. Pliny mentions, 'Servio Tullio dormienti in pueritiâ ex capite flammam emicuisse;' ii. 111. The same account is given by Val. Max. i. 6, 1, and Servius, ad Æn. ii. 683. A different version of it was given by Valerius Antias; he connects it with the death of Gegania, the wife of Servius: Plut. de Fort. Rom. 10. A similar prodigy happened to L. Marcius in the Second Punic War: flammam ei concionanti fusam e capite, sine ipsius sensu, cum magno pavore circumstantium militum; Livy, xxv. 39. The latter prodigy was reported by Valerius Antias, Plin. ubi sup. A story similar to that of the conception of Servius was told, by a writer named Promathion, of the twin founders of Rome. Plut. Rom. 2. See above, p. 401. Virgil ascribes to Iulus, when he was leaving Troy, a prodigy like that which distinguished the young Servius. Compare also the burning of Lavinia, Æn. vii. 71—80. Silius has applied the prodigy to Masinissa, xvi. 118—131. The stories that a swarm of bees settled on the lips of the youthful Pindar, and Plato, and made honey upon them, are somewhat similar: Paus. ix. 23, § 2; Ælian. V. H. xii. 45; Cic. Div. i. 36. According to Cato, Cæculus, the founder of Præneste, was found in a hearth: whence it was believed that he was the son of Vulcan: Krause, p. 107. The mother of Cæculus likewise conceived from a spark which flew out of the fire. Servius, ad Æn. vii. 678. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 703, who remarks, p. 713, that there are not less than six or seven different accounts of the origin of Servius Tullius.

(41) Servus vernaque Tuscorum, Justin, xxxviii. 6, cited by Schwegler. Syncellus, vol. i. p. 449, ed. Bonn. calls Servius, ὁ καὶ Σίλβιος Τοῦλλος ὁ ἐκ δούλης, which seems to be an attempt to connect him with the Alban Silvii.

(42) Dion. Hal. iii. 68—72, iv. 3; Livy, i. 40; Cic. Rep. ii. 21, who appears to insinuate that Servius was the natural child of Tarquin; Zon. vii. 9.

the late king, and by the assistance and favour of Tanaquil, his queen.(43) The sons of Ancus are described by Livy, as deciding to murder Tarquin, in preference to Servius; because, if they killed the latter, another son-in-law of Tarquin would succeed to the throne.(44) After this time, the sons of Ancus disappear. They are described as going into exile to Suessa Pometia; the actual authors of Tarquin's death being alone executed.(45)

Fabius, and most of the Roman historians prior to Dionysius and Livy, described Tarquin as leaving at his death two young children.(46) Dionysius, however, has no difficulty in showing, by a comparison of dates and ages, that this statement involves a chronological absurdity: for that Tanaquil must have been seventy-five years old at the death of Tarquin, and therefore could not have had young children: whereas, if we suppose her eldest son to have then reached his twenty-seventh year, he would have been seventy years old when he threw Servius down the steps of the senate-house—an act which supposes him to be in the prime of his life: moreover, after his expulsion from Rome, in his ninety-fifth year, he continues to take an active part in warfare, and he does not die till his 110th year. Some of the Roman historians, he proceeds to say, perceiving these inconsistencies, represented Tarquin as marrying a second wife, named Gegania, by whom he had two sons—late in his life.(47) Dionysius however rejects this contrivance as improbable and insufficiently attested; the solution to which he gives the preference, is that proposed by L. Piso, that they were the grandsons, not the sons, of the king. He makes afterwards a similar supposition, for a similar reason, with respect to L. Tarquinus Collatinus, whom Fabius and most of the historians made a son of Egerius, and a contemporary of the younger Tarquin; this Collatinus is declared by Dionysius to have been in fact his grandson.(48) This conversion of sons into grandsons is however a merely arbitrary conjecture, unsupported by external testimony; and the inconsistencies which it seeks to remove must be regarded as characteristic of the legendary texture of the narrative.

---

(43) Victor, de Vir. Ill. 7, says: Servius Tullius quasi precario regnare cœpit, sed recto imperium ministravit. *Precario* means by sufferance, not by right. Florus gives a similar account: 'Ergo inter Tarquinii mortem, annitente reginâ, substitutus in locum regis, quasi ad tempus, regnum dolo partum sic egit industrie, ut jure adeptus videretur;' i. 6. A toga regia undulata, in the temple of Fortune, which Servius was said to have worn, was ascribed to the workmanship of Tanaquil. Plin. N. H. viii. 74. Compare Varro ap. Non. ii. 926.

(44) Sed et injuriæ dolor in Tarquinium ipsum magis quam in Servium eos stimulabat; et quia gravior ultor cædis, si superesset, rex futurus erat, quam privatus: tum Servio occiso, quemcunque alium generum delegisset, eundem regni heredem facturus videbatur; Livy, i. 40.

(45) Dion. Hal. iv. 4-5. Livy, i. 41.

(46) Dion. Hal. iv. 1, 6, 7. In the former passage, the sense requires *υἱωνοὺς* for *υἱούς*. Livy, i. 46, says of L. Tarquinius the younger: Prisci Tarquinii regis filius neposne fuerit, parum liquet; pluribus tamen auctoribus filium ediderim. Cicero, Rep. ii. 21, merely says: Itaque Tarquinius, qui admodum parvos tum habebat liberos. In Brut. 14, he speaks of Tarquinius Superbus as the son of the former king. Victor, de Vir. Ill. c. 7, § 15. states that the younger Tarquins are the sons of the king. Gellius, N. A. xvii. 21, § 6, Strabo, v. 3. § 4. and Eutropius i. 7, make Tarquinius Superbus the son of Priscus. The emperor Claudius, in his oration on the Gauls, says that the authorities are not agreed whether Superbus was the son or grandson of Priscus.

According to Livy, Servius began to reign with the consent of the Senate, though without the vote of the people.(49) Some time afterwards, hearing that the young Tarquin had tried to raise discontent against him on this ground, he first sought the popular favour by dividing some land taken in war among the plebeians, and then put the question to the vote, in the popular assembly, whether he should be king. The majority in his favour was greater than it had been for any previous king, and he now reigned by the election of the people. The Senate however were displeased by his measure for dividing the public land, and Tarquin assiduously fomented their disaffection.(50)

The detailed account given by Dionysius of the means used by Servius for securing the crown, differs widely from the view taken by Livy. According to Dionysius, Servius first appears merely in the character of regent, or guardian, for the youthful sons of Tarquin; but the Senate are hostile to him from the beginning, and intend to require him to lay aside the royal emblems until he has gone through the legal forms of the election. Hereupon, Servius, in order to counteract their designs, convenes an assembly of the people, to whom he presents the children of Tarquin, declaring himself, at the same time, to be their guardian. He then bids for popular favour by offering to pay the debts of the poorer citizens, and to prohibit lending on the security of the body of a freeman; and also by promising a census of property, and a division of the public land. The people willingly accept these proposals; and Servius proceeds to register the debts of the insolvent, and to discharge them out of his own funds; after which, by a royal ordinance, he ejects the occupiers of the public land, and divides it among the citizens who are destitute of land;(51) renewing, at the same time, some laws of Romulus and Numa which had fallen into desuetude. In consequence of the popular measures adopted by Servius, the Senate now change their course: instead of driving him to a vote of the people, which is sure to turn out in his favour, they remain quiescent, thinking that his power will be weakened by its continuing without any legal origin. Servius, however, outmanœuvres the Senate. He appears one day in the market-place, meanly clad, with his mother Ocrisia, with Tanaquil, the widow of the late king, and the rest of the royal family; and he addresses the people in an artful harangue, in which he accuses the patricians of a deliberate attempt to depose him, and proclaims his own patriotic dispositions; but at the end offers to resign the crown, if such is the popular will. The people implore him to retain the royal authority; and at the suggestion of certain agents, disposed by him among the multitude, they cry out to him to put the question to the vote. He then appoints a day for the election; the curiæ are unanimous in his favour, but the Senate refuse their sanction. Servius disregards their refusal, and considers his election by the people as complete without the confirmation of the Senate.(52) Cicero's brief account agrees rather with that of Dionysius than of Livy; he describes Servius as originally obtaining the regal power on the false pretence of being the vicegerent of Tarquin, as winning the popular favour by paying the debts of insolvent citizens, and as being shortly afterwards elected by the people, in spite of the Senate.(53)

---

(47) Valerius Antias stated that Gegania was the wife of Servius Tullius, not of Tarquin. Plut. de Fort. Rom. 10.

(48) iv. 64. Compare Schwegler, i. 1, p. 49.

(49) Servius, præsidio firmo munitus, primus injussu populi, voluntate patrum, regnavit; i. 41.

(50) Ib. c. 46.

---

(51) The division of *public* land among the poorer citizens is very clearly marked in the three passages of Dionysius, iv. 9, 10, and 11: cf. 13. The words *οὔτε χάριτι λαβόντας οὔτε ὠνῇ κτησαμένους*, in c. 9, seem to mean that the occupiers of the public land had obtained it neither as grantees nor as purchasers, and that therefore they were mere encroachers or trespassers. Victor, de Vir. Ill. 7, states that Servius made a distribution of corn among the people: Populum in quatuor tribus distribuit, ac post plebi distribuit annonam.

§ 26 Servius, undertaking the part of a great popular reformer, carries into effect various important measures, particularly measures of internal organization, and classification of the citizens. In the first place, he adds two new hills to the city, which, with the hills enclosed by previous kings, made seven: he surrounds these with a single wall, and divides the city thus enlarged into four local tribes, in the place of the three hereditary tribes which had previously existed;(54) at the same time, he institutes the Compitalia—certain annual sacrifices offered by every householder at chapels of the lares, in which the ministration was to be performed by slaves—a religious ceremony which was still celebrated in this form at the time of Dionysius.(55) Furthermore, he divides the country into twenty-six tribes, according to Fabius; or thirty-one, according to Vennonius;(56) and he establishes certain forts, called pagi, as places of refuge in time of war for the country people, with which a festival called Paganalia, still celebrated in the Augustan age, was combined.(57) Dionysius seems to have forgotten that he had already attributed the institution of the pagi to Numa.(58) We are likewise assured that Servius connected with the institution of the pagi a numerical census of the country population; and that he established a similar census for the city, in connexion with certain temples. The latter fact was attested by the historian L. Piso. He likewise made a law requiring all Romans to return an assessment of their own property, stating at the same time their age, their parents, wife and children, and their place of residence; each citizen was bound to make these returns, upon pain of confiscation of property, and of being flogged, and sold as a slave. This law, Dionysius adds, remained for a long time in force.(59)

---

(52) Dion. Hal. iv. 8—12.

(53) Sed cum Tarquinius insidiis Anci filiorum interisset, Serviusque regnare cœpisset, non jussu, sed voluntate atque concessu civium, quod cum Tarquinius ex vulnere æger fuisse et vivere falso diceretur, ille regio ornatu jus dixisset, obæratosque pecuniâ suâ liberavisset, multâque comitate usus jussu Tarquinii se jus dicere probavisset, non commisit se patribus, sed Tarquinio sepulto, populum de se ipse consuluit, jussusque regnare legem de imperio suo curiatam tulit; De Rep. ii. 21.

(54) Livy, i. 43, mentions the division of the city by Servius into regions, or tribes. According to Livy, the two hills which Servius adds to the city are the Quirinal and Viminal. Dion. Hal. iv. 13, says that they were the Esquiline and Viminal.

(55) ἣν ἔτι καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἑορτὴν ἄγοντες Ῥωμαῖοι ἐτέλουν, ὀλίγαις ὕστερον ἡμέραις τῶν Κρονίων, σεμνὴν ἐν ταῖς πάνυ καὶ πολυτελῆ, Κομπιτάλια προσαγο-

---

ρεύοντες αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τῶν στενωπῶν· κομπίτους γὰρ τοὺς στενωποὺς καλοῦσι· καὶ φυλάττουσι τὸν ἀρχαῖον ἐθισμὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν, διὰ τῶν θεραπόντων τοὺς ἥρωας ἱλασκόμενοι, καὶ ἅπαν τὸ δοῦλον αὐτῶν ἀφαιροῦντες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις; Dion. Hal. iv. 14. Compare Suet. Oct. 31. Pliny connects the institution of the Compitalia and games for the lares with the miraculous conception of Servius, and the lambent flame round his head, which made him be regarded as the son of the household lar; N. H. xxxvi. 70. Ovid, above, p. 108, speaks of him as the son of Vulcan, on account of the appearance on the hearth. According to Macrobius, Sat. i. 7, the Compitalia were *restored* by Tarquinius Superbus (their first author not being stated), at the command of the oracle of Apollo, which required that heads should be offered for heads. At first, human sacrifices were performed, but Junius Brutus altered the practice, by substituting heads of garlic and poppy, as a literal fulfilment of the oracle. This commutation of heads of garlic for human heads seems to have been a favourite equivocation in antiquity: it recurs in the story of Numa, above, n. 132, and in the Locrian treaty, Polyb. xii. 6. On the Compitalia, see Becker, ii. 1, p. 174.

(56) This passage, which is confused and unintelligible in the MSS. is restored with great probability by Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 973. His restoration is approved of by Becker, ii. 1, p. 167.

(57) *ἑορτήν τινα, καὶ ταύτην ἐν ταῖς πάνυ τιμίαν, καταστησάμενος, τὰ καλούμενα Παγανάλια· καὶ νόμους ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν τούτων, οὓς ἔτι διὰ φυλακῆς ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι, συνέγραψεν*; Dion. Hal. iv. 15. Compare Becker, ii. 1, p. 172.

(58) ii. 76. Above, p. 447.

(59) *καὶ μέχρι πολλοῦ διέμεινε παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις οὗτος ὁ νόμος*; iv. 15. Livy, 44, says: censu perfecto, quem maturaverat metu legis de incensis latae cum vinculorum minis mortisque.

§ 27 Having laid this foundation, Servius proceeded to erect upon it an institution with which his name was always connected in subsequent times, and which was regarded as one of the main elements of the prosperity and greatness of Rome.(60) This was, his classification of the people according to the assessment of their property, by which their votes in the popular assembly and their service in war were determined. The scheme is set forth in detail both by Dionysius and Livy, with a close agreement in all the leading facts, though with some discrepancy in the details. The differences between them, though unimportant, prove that they either followed different authors, or that, if they both followed the same author, one or both of them wrote from memory. The following is a statement of the Servian classification, according to these two historians:—

	CENTURIES.
Knights, or horsemen................................	18

CLASS I.

Assessment at 100,000 asses and upwards—

Seniors (above forty-five years)	40
Juniors (under „)	40

To serve on foot, and to provide a helmet, shield, breastplate, and greaves, all of brass; also a spear and a sword. The juniors to serve in the field and in the front rank; the seniors to defend the city.

Carpenters to supply warlike machines............	2

CLASS II.

Assessment at less than 100,000, and more than 75,000 asses.

To provide wooden instead of brazen shields, and not to furnish breastplates.(61)

---

(60) σοφώτατον πάντων πολιτευμάτων εἰσηγήσατο, καὶ μεγίστων Ῥωμαίοις ἀγαθῶν αἴτιον, ὡς τὰ ἔργα ἐδήλωσε; Dion. Hal. iv. 16. Censum enim instituit, rem saluberrimam tanto futuro imperio; Livy, i. 42. Sequitur is, qui mihi videtur ex omnibus in republicâ vidisse plurimum; Cic. de Rep. ii. 21.

(61) The metal shield was round and small. The wooden shield was oblong, and covered the whole body, so that it rendered a breastplate less necessary.

To serve in the second rank.

	CENTURIES.
Seniors	10
Juniors	10

CLASS III.

Assessment at less than 75,000 and more than 50,000 asses.

Seniors	10
Juniors	10

To serve in the third rank, and not to provide greaves.

CLASS IV.

Assessment at less than 50,000 and more than 25,000 asses.

Seniors	10
Juniors	10

To provide a sword, a spear, and a wooden shield, and to stand in the last rank.

CLASS V.

Assessment at less than 25,000 and more than 11,000 asses.

Seniors	15
Juniors	15

To serve as skirmishers, with slings and javelins.

Accensi, trumpeters, and hornblowers	2

CLASS VI.

Assessment under 11,000 asses.

No military service	1(62)

---

(62) The differences between Dionysius and Livy are, that Dionysius estimates the assessment in Greek minas, taking the mina=one thousand asses; that he places the two centuries of carpenters in the second, instead of the first class; that he places two centuries of the cornicines and tubicines in the fourth class, whereas Livy gives three centuries to the accensi, cornicines, and tubicines, and places them in the fifth class; that he makes the assessment of the fifth class 12,500 instead of 11,000 asses; and that Livy does not recognise the single century of the capite censi as a sixth class. Cicero and other Latin writers likewise speak of five classes. See Becker, ii. 3, p. 12. These differences are not very material. Livy makes the total number of centuries 194 instead of 193, the number recognised both by Dionysius and Cicero. The conjecture of Sigonius, *duas* for *tres centurias* in Livy is probably right; some transcriber having altered the text, who thought that the accensi, cornicines, and tubicines must each have a century. See Dion. Hal. iv. 16—21, vii. 59; Livy, i. 43; Becker, ii. 1, p. 198—218; Schwegler, ib. p. 738—65. Concerning the proletarii and capite censi, see Gell. N. A. xvi. 10; Cic. Rep. ii. 22.

The relations of the classes, with respect to the right of voting, will be more clearly perceived from the subjoined summary :—

	CENTURIES.
Knights	18
First class	80
Carpenters	2
Second class	20
Third class	20
Fourth class	20
Fifth class	30
Accensi, &c.	2
Sixth class	1
	193

Cicero, in the passage of the Republic which describes the Servian classes,(63) follows a different scheme. His highest class contains only 89 centuries; it appears to be formed as follows :—

	CENTURIES.
Knights	18
First class of assessments	70
Carpenters	1
	89

---

(63) Nunc rationem videtis esse talem, ut equitum centuriæ cum sex suffragiis, et prima classis, additâ centuriâ, quæ ad summum usum urbis fabris tignariis est data, octoginta novem centurias habeat: quibus ex centum quatuor centuriis (tot enim reliquæ sunt) octo solæ si accesserunt, confecta est vis populi universa; reliquaque multo major multitudo sex et nonaginta centuriarum neque excluderetur suffragiis, ne superbum esset, nec valeret nimis, ne esset periculosum; De Rep. ii. 22. This passage, corrected by the hand of a reviser, stands thus in the MS. of the Republic. The revisions of MSS. were made with care in antiquity, (see Gräfenhan, Gesch. der Klass. Philologie, vol. ii. p. 359, vol. iii. p. 3, § 5) and there is no reason for doubting that this reading rests on as good authority as the rest of the text. It is perfectly consistent with itself: for 89+104=193, and if 8 is taken from 104 and added to 89, a majority is obtained for the first class. Nevertheless, it has been the subject of numerous conjectural alterations of the text, and of a whole series of controversial writings: all founded on the gratuitous assumption that it is necessary to reconcile the account of Cicero with that of Dionysius and Livy. The writings on this passage are enumerated by Becker, ii. 1, p. 203. Schwegler, p. 741.

This leaves 104 centuries, instead of 93, for the remaining classes; and therefore, as Cicero says, eight centuries from those classes must be added to the centuries of the highest class, in order to make a majority. He assumes, with Dionysius and Livy, that the total number of centuries is 193, and that 97 is a majority; but the centuries of the knights and the first class are, according to their statement, sufficient to make a majority by themselves (98 out of 193): whereas, according to Cicero, they are only 89 to 104.

When this classification had been effected, Servius mustered the people, in their proper divisions and armour, in a large field; and performed a lustration, or purification, with a bull, a ram, and a goat (or pig).(64) He then dedicated the field to Mars, and it acquired henceforward the name of *Campus Martius*.(65) This ceremony, called a lustrum, was still performed in the time of Dionysius, after every census. The number of persons included in the assessment made by Servius was, according to the registers of the censors, 82,700. According to Fabius Pictor, this was then the number of men able to bear arms.(66) Dionysius likewise attributes to Servius the institution, still in force in his time, of enrolling the freedmen in the tribes. He describes the patricians as objecting to this liberal measure; but Servius makes them a speech, and convinces them of their error; they withdraw their opposition; and the institution remained unshaken, and regarded as holy, even in the Augustan age.(67)

Both Dionysius and Livy distinctly state that, before Servius, the popular suffrage was so arranged, that the vote of each citizen had an equal value, and that the poor were on a footing of perfect equality with the rich.(68) Servius is described as introducing his system of classes, in order to remedy this evil, and to give to the rich a greater weight in the state. He effects this object by throwing the chief part of the burden of military service, and of war-taxes, upon the rich, at the same time that he secures to them a decisive preponderance in the suffrage; thus acting, on a large scale, upon the principle, that 'Qui sentit commodum, sentire debet et onus.' His theory, according to Dionysius, was that money is the motive of war; that therefore, the rich having most to lose, would be most ready to make exertions for military purposes, and to expose themselves to danger, whereas those who had nothing at stake, ought to be excused from all sacrifice; having an immunity from property taxes on account of their poverty, and an immunity from military service on account of their immunity from taxation: for at this time the Romans served without pay, and provided themselves with arms and other things requisite in the field.(69) On examining the scheme of the Servian classes, already given, it will be seen that the pressure of military service, of danger in the field, and of war-taxation, is proportioned to the assessment; so that it bears most heavily upon those of the largest, and most lightly upon those of the smallest assessment; while those whose assessment is below a certain amount (11,000 asses) are altogether exempt. In order to compensate the rich for their larger share of the burden, he counteracts the numerical principle of voting by the method of composite units. The people are distributed into centuries; and the votes of the citizens are taken in each century separately; but the vote of each century is determined by the majority, and reckons only as one. Hence, by making the centuries of the highly assessed citizens much more numerous than those of the low assessments, it is possible to neutralize the votes of the latter, who are the great majority, and to give a decided superiority to the latter, who are a small minority, of the whole body of the citizens.(70) In the Servian constitution, this principle was carried to a very great length; for, according to Livy and Dionysius, the centuries of the knights and of the first class amounted to ninety-eight, being more than a majority of the 193 centuries; and the sixth class, comprehending all the citizens of the lowest assessment, which was doubtless the most numerous of all, formed only one century.(71) Even Cicero, who follows a different account from that adopted by Dionysius and Livy, makes the centuries of the knights and the first class amount to eighty-eight. The result was that, if the centuries of the highest assessment were agreed, their votes decided the question; and the other centuries could exercise no influence on the matter. Dionysius and Livy both affirm that this was the usual course; and that the inferior classes were rarely called upon to vote, the question having been already settled by the centuries of the highest assessment.(72)

---

(64) Called Suovetaurilia.

(65) Another origin for the Campus Martius connected it with the confiscation of land which had belonged to the Tarquins: see Becker, vol. i. p. 621.

(66) Dion. Hal. iv. 22. Livy states the sum in round numbers at 80,000; and it is to this amount that the testimony of Fabius refers. Eutropius, i. 7, says that the number of citizens enumerated in the Servian census, including those in the country, was 83,000: nearly agreeing with Dionysius.

(67) Dion. Hal. iv. 22-3. The following chapter c. 24, contains some curious remarks on the state of slavery among the Romans; and, on the abuses (as Dionysius conceives) of the practice of manumission.

---

(68) Censum instituit ex quo belli pacisque munia non viritim, ut ante, sed pro habitu pecuniarum fierent; Livy, i. 42. Non enim (ut ab Romulo traditum ceteri servaverant reges) viritim suffragium eâdem vi eodemque jure promiscue omnibus datum est; sed gradus facti, &c. c. 43. *καὶ ἦσαν οἱ τὰ ἐλάχιστα κεκτημένοι τοῖς τὰς μεγίστας ἔχουσιν οὐσίας ἰσόψηφοι· ὀλίγων δὲ ὄντων, ὥσπερ εἰκὸς, τῶν πλουσίων, οἱ πένητες ἐν ταῖς ψηφοφορίαις ἐπεκράτουν, μακρῷ πλείους ὄντες ἐκείνων*; Dion. Hal. iv. 20. In vii. 59, Dionysius seems to forget himself: for he there says, of the time of Coriolanus, *τότε πρῶτον ἐγένετο Ῥωμαίοις ἐκκλησία κατ' ἄνδρα ψηφοφόρος, ἡ φυλετική*; and he adds that the patricians ask for the comitia centuriata, as being *πάτριον αὐτοῖς*, their hereditary right. Perhaps, however, he means to confine himself to the time of the Republic: though this was only eighteen years old at the time.

(69) See Dion. Hal. iv. 19.

---

(70) *τοῦτον δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἅπαν ἐπιθεὶς τὸ βάρος τοῖς πλουσίοις τῶν τε κινδύνων καὶ τῶν ἀναλωμάτων, ὡς εἶδεν ἀγανακτοῦντας αὐτοὺς, δι' ἑτέρου τρόπου τήν τε ἀθυμίαν αὐτῶν παρεμυθήσατο, καὶ τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπράϋνε, πλεονέκτημα δωρησάμενος, ἐξ οὗ πάσης ἔμελλον τῆς πολιτείας ἔσεσθαι κύριοι, τοὺς πένητας ἀπελάσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν*; Dion. Hal. iv. 20. Gradus facti, ut neque exclusus quisquam suffragio videretur, et vis omnis penes primores civitatis esset; Livy, i. 43. Populum distribuit in quinque classes—eosque ita disparavit, ut suffragia non in multitudinis, sed in locupletium potestate essent, curavitque, quod semper in republicâ tenendum est, ne plurimum valeant plurimi; Cic. Rep. ii. 22. Afterwards he adds that it was arranged that the majority of citizens, with the lower assessments, neque excluderetur suffragiis, ne superbum esset, nec valeret nimis, ne esset periculosum. Again: Ita nec prohibebatur quisquam jure suffragii, et is valebat in suffragio plurimum, cujus plurimum intererat esse in optimo statu civitatem.

(71) *καὶ τὰ μὲν πολλὰ τῶν ἀγωνισμάτων ἐπὶ τῶν πρώτων κλήσεων τέλος ἐλάμβανεν, ὡς μηδὲν ἔτι δεῖν τῶν ἐσχάτων· σπανίως δέ που πρᾶγμα οὕτως ἐνδοιαζόμενον ἐνέπιπτεν, ὥστε μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης ψήφου τῆς τῶν ἀπορωτάτων προελθεῖν*; Dion. Hal. vii. 59. Compare a similar statement in iv. 20. Equites enim vocabantur primi; octoginta inde primæ classis centuriæ: ibi si variaret, *quod raro incidebat*, ut secundæ classis vocarentur: nec fere unquam infra ita descenderent, ut ad infimos pervenirent; Livy, i. 43. Dionysius describes the election of L. Quinctius Cincinnatus to the consulship in 460 B.C. as made by the eighteen centuries of knights, and the eighty centuries of the first class of infantry: this gave a majority of three centuries (ninety-eight to ninety-five), and therefore the remaining centuries were not called; x. 17. This event, according to the received chronology, was seventy-five years after the death of Servius.

Dionysius concludes his description of the Servian division of classes, by saying that this form of the constitution was preserved by the Romans for many generations; but that it had been changed, in his time, into a more democratic system, under the pressure of necessity; not by a dissolution of the centuries, but by an alteration in the order of their voting, as he had himself often witnessed, when present at their assemblies.(73)

---

(72) Illarum autem sex et nonaginta centuriarum in unâ centuriâ tum quidem plures censebantur, quam pœne in primâ classe totâ; Cic. de Rep. ii. 22. The total number of centuries being 193, it follows that ninety-seven is a majority, and ninety-six a minority. Owing to the importance of the votes of the first class, it was called simply *classis*, and all the other centuries were said to be *infra classem:* see Festus, p. 113; Gell. vii. 13; Becker, ii. 1, p. 213.

(73) *οὗτος ὁ κόσμος τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἐπὶ πολλὰς διέμεινε γενεὰς φυλαττόμενος ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων· ἐν δὲ τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς κεκίνηται χρόνοις, καὶ μεταβέβληται εἰς τὸ δημοτικώτερον, ἀνάγκαις τισὶ βιασθεὶς ἰσχυραῖς, οὐ τῶν λόχων καταλυθέντων, ἀλλὰ τῆς κλήσεως αὐτῶν οὐκέτι τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀκρίβειαν φυλαττούσης, ὡς ἔγνων ταῖς ἀρχαιρεσίαις αὐτῶν πολλάκις παρών*; Dion. Hal. iv. 21. Compare Becker (by Marquardt), ii. 3, p. 28. The interpretation of this passage proposed by Goettling, Röm. Staatsverfassung, p. 380, seems to me inadmissible. The Servian institutions are described by Sallust as being in force with respect to military service, in the time of Marius; for he expressly states that Marius violated them: 'Ipse interea milites scribere, non more majorum, neque ex classibus, sed uti cujusque lubido erat, capite censos plerosque;' Bell. Jug. 86. The *capite censi*, being the lowest class, were according to that system exempt from military service. Others referred this measure of Marius to the Cimbrian war; Gell. N. A. xvi. 10. On the other hand, Appian implies that the mode of voting by centuries was obsolete in the time of Sylla: *Εἰσηγοῦντό τε μηδὲν ἔτι ἀπροβούλευτον ἐς τὸν δῆμον ἐσφέρεσθαι, νενομισμένον μὲν οὕτω καὶ πάλαι, παραλελυμένον δ' ἐκ πολλοῦ· καὶ τὰς χειροτονίας μὴ κατὰ φυλάς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ λόχους, ὡς Τύλλιος βασιλεὺς ἔταξε, γίγνεσθαι· νομίσαντες διὰ δυοῖν τοῖνδε οὔτε νόμον οὐδένα πρὸ τῆς βουλῆς ἐς τὸ πλῆθος ἐσφερόμενον, οὔτε τὰς χειροτονίας ἐν τοῖς πένησι καὶ θρασυτάτοις ἀντὶ τῶν ἐν περιουσίᾳ καὶ εὐβουλίᾳ γιγνομένας, δώσειν ἔτι στάσεων ἀφορμάς*: De Bell. Civ. i 59. It seems by no means improbable that this statement was derived by Appian from some contemporary writer, who understood what he was writing about; and if this be so, it proves that at the time in question (88 B.C.) the votes were ordinarily taken by tribes, without reference to centuries; but that the effect of voting by centuries,

Livy likewise intimates that the Servian constitution had been altered, by the adaptation of the centuries to the tribes, and by the increase in the number of the latter.(74) The nature, extent, and time of this modification of the ancient Servian constitution have been the subject of much learned enquiry and acute reasoning. The evidence is imperfect and fragmentary, but whatever changes this ancient system may successively have undergone, it is manifest that Dionysius considered it as having subsisted, in its essential features, up to his own time.(75)

§ 28 The division of classes, attributed to Servius, is one of the most curious remains of the political institutions of antiquity. Its characteristic feature is the combination of taxation and military service with the suffrage. The rich appropriate to themselves a decisive superiority in the voting, but they at the same time submit to the heaviest burden of taxation, and to the severest military service. That this system of classes continued to exist, as an operative institution, in the historical age; that

---

in giving a preponderance to the rich and educated was well known, and that Servius was then considered as the author of the system. Ennius, in a passage of the 3rd book of his Annals, describes the proletarii as, contrary to the usual practice, being armed with a sword and shield at the public expense, and defending the walls of the city in some emergency; but it seems to have no special reference to the Servian census.

Proletarius publicitus scutisque feroque
Ornatur ferro: muros urbemque forumque
Excubiis curant.—Ap. Gell. N. A. xvi. 10.

Dr. Arnold points out the difficulty of reconciling the accounts of the Servian constitution with the events of the subsequent history. 'Whenever (he says) we find any details given of the proceedings of the Comitia, or of the construction of the army, we perceive a state of things very different from that prescribed by the constitution of Servius. Hence have arisen the difficulties connected with it; for as it was never fully carried into effect, but overthrown within a very few years after its formation, and only gradually and in part restored; as thus the constitution with which the oldest annalists, and even the law books which they copied, were familiar, was not the original constitution of Servius, but one bearing its name, while in reality it greatly differed from it; there is a constant confusion between the two, and what is ascribed to the one may often be true only when understood of the other;' Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 77.

(74) i. 43. Compare Becker, ib. p. 18.

(75) See the excellent dissertation of Marquardt. in Becker, ib. p. 1—37, who has collected and arranged all the passages bearing on the question, and has analyzed them with a sobriety of judgment and an abstinence from fanciful hypothesis which are rarely to be found in the writers on Roman antiquity.

an authentic description of it existed among the official records of the censor's office; that it was of considerable antiquity, and that it was believed to be the work of Servius, may be considered as certain. Dionysius represents this constitution as a political trick by which Servius succeeds in deceiving the people. According to his account, Servius holds out the bait of immunity from taxation and military service: and the people, attracted by this advantage, swallow the hook of virtual disfranchisement which it conceals.(76) This however is doubtless one of the conjectural explanations of the motives of ancient lawgivers, which the classical historians so readily supplied: it cannot be considered as more authentic than the accounts of the motives of Cyrus, for the ancient Persian institutions, which Xenophon reports in his Cyropædia. Nothing is more unlikely than that a measure of this kind, affecting the political rights of an entire community, should have been completely misunderstood by the persons who had the strongest interest in understanding it; and that the large majority of the Roman people should have been cheated by a lawgiver into the voluntary adoption of a law which seemed to be beneficial, but which in fact destroyed their political importance. However ignorant and unintelligent we may suppose the bulk of the Roman people to have been, and however little able to discover for themselves the secret designs of the legislator, they would nevertheless have understood the explanations of others; and there was nothing to prevent their leaders, or other persons of more advanced political sagacity, from addressing them in public, and tracing the probable consequences of the measure. The system bears the appearance of having been the slow and deliberate result of a compromise between the different orders in the state; and of having been made at a time (as Dionysius says) when the citizens served without pay. The exemption from war taxation and the chief dangers of military service may have been a sufficient inducement to the poorer citizens to acquiesce in political insignificance.(77) It can however hardly be supposed that it succeeded a completely democratic system of voting, as both Livy and Dionysius declare, in which every citizen's vote, whatever might be his social position, had an equal value. Such a state of things cannot have existed in any Greek or Italian Republic at the time assigned to the reign of Servius, 557—35 B.C., shortly after the legislation of Solon.(78) Niebuhr, and other recent writers on the early Roman constitution, have indeed attempted to get over this difficulty by assuming that the curiæ before Servius consisted only of patricians; and that the *populus*, or community entitled to the suffrage, was exclusive of the plebeians; but this hypothesis, though more consistent with general probability than the other account, is opposed to the positive declarations of the ancient historians. On the other hand, the Servian constitution implies a full development of the political activity of the wealthier class of citizens; and it cannot be reconciled with the existence of a government in which a king is the chief moving power. Servius again is represented as a popular ruler; mindful of his servile origin, he sympathizes with the common people: he was the author of the liberties of Rome, and had even intended to give a completely democratic constitution to the state; he curtailed the powers both of the king and the Senate ;(79) and the regulations for the election of consuls were supposed to have been found among his papers: in later times he was the favourite king of the plebeian order, and was regarded by them with peculiar veneration.(80) But how is this

---

(76) τοῦτο διαπραξάμενος ἔλαθε τοὺς δημοτικούς: iv. 20. τοῦτο τὸ πολίτευμα καταστησάμενος καὶ πλεονέκτημα τοῖς πλουσίοις τηλικοῦτον ἔλαθε τὸν δῆμον, ὥσπερ ἔφην, καταστρατηγήσας, καὶ τοὺς πένητας ἀπελάσας τῶν κοινῶν . . . . ἐξηπατῶντο δὲ τῷ τε μίαν εἶναι ψῆφον ὅλου τοῦ λόχου, τοῦ τε ὀλίγους ἔχοντας ἐν αὐτῷ πολίτας καὶ τοῦ πάνυ πολλούς; ib. 21.

---

(77) Livy, after describing the Servian system of taxation and military service, adds: Hæc omnia in dites a pauperibus inclinata onera; i. 43.

(78) The four classes which Solon is said to have established at Athens somewhat resemble the Servian classes. They are founded upon an assessment of property; and the assessments serve as the foundation of a graduated property tax. The military service is moreover regulated according to them; and the thetes, the fourth and lowest class, are exempt from this obligation; though on extraordinary occasions they might be armed at the expense of the state. The thetes, however, seem to have had an equal vote in the public assembly and in the courts of justice, with the members of the other classes: their only disqualification was that they were excluded from public offices: there was nothing in the Solonian constitution which resembled the Roman system of centuries in the different classes. See Plut. Sol. 18. Harpocrat. in θῆτες. Boeckh, Econ. of Ath. b. 4, c. 5; Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. iii. p. 154—61. On the differences between the Servian constitution and the Greek timocracies, see Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 385.

---

(79) Dion. Hal. iv. 10, speaks of the patricians καταλυομένην τὴν δυναστείαν τῆς βουλῆς ὁρῶντες. Below, c. 25, Servius is described as surrendering half the regal power, by assigning all the civil jurisdiction to private judges, and limiting their discretion by fixed laws. He reserves only the criminal jurisdiction to the kings. This account however does not agree with ii. 24, where it is said that the jurisdiction of minor wrongs was transferred to the Senate. In v. 2, the laws of Tullius concerning contracts are described as φιλάνθρωποι καὶ δημοτικοὶ εἶναι δοκοῦντες. He is called a δημοτικώτατος βασιλεύς, v. 71.

(80) Tullius qui libertatem civibus stabiliverat, is a verse from the Brutus of Accius, which referred to Servius. See Ribbeck, Trag. Lat. Rel. p. 240; Goettling Röm. Staatsverf. p. 231. The birth of Accius is placed at 170 B.C. The plebeians likewise celebrated the nones of each month in his memory, as being his birthday; Macrob. Sat. i. 13, 16. The following is one of the explanations suggested by Ovid for a statue of Servius with the head muffled:—

> An magis est verum post Tulli funera plebem
> Confusam placidi morte fuisse ducis?
> Nec modus ullus erat; crescebat imagine luctus,
> Donec eam positis occuluere togis.—Fast. vi. 575—8.

and again, on the temple of Fors Fortuna, said to have been founded by Servius:—

> Plebs colit hanc quia qui posuit de plebe fuisse
> Fertur, et ex humili sceptra fuisse loco.
> Convenit et servis, servâ quia Tullius ortus
> Constituit dubiæ templa propinqua deæ.—ib. vi. 773—6.

Livy speaks of his intention to resign his royalty into the hands of the people: Id ipsum tam mite ac tam moderatum imperium, tamen, quia unius esset, deponere eum in animo habuisse quidam auctores sunt; i. 48. ἐπιεικὴς δὲ καὶ μέτριος ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἔλυσε τὰς ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ πάντα κατὰ τοὺς νόμους πρᾶξαι διαβολὰς τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ἔργοις, παρέσχε δὲ πολλοῖς ὑπόληψιν ὡς, εἰ μὴ θᾶττον ἀνῃρέθη, μεταστήσων τὸ σχῆμα τῆς πολιτείας εἰς δημοκρατίαν; Dion. Hal. iv. 40. Tanaquil is even said to have compelled him to take an oath that he would not abolish the royal office, which he intended to do; Plut. de Fort. Rom. 10. Servius is likewise said to have compelled the patricians to live in a street which was commanded from neighbouring heights; so that if they made any hostile movement against him, it might easily be suppressed; Festus, p. 221. Patricius vicus Romæ dictus, eo quod ibi patricii habitaverint, jubente Servio Tullio, ut, si quid molirentur adversus ipsum, ex locis superioribus opprimerentur. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 527. A similar account is given by Varro, for the origin of the name of the Tuscus Vicus, *both* of them being probably mere conjectures founded upon the low situation of the streets. He states that the Etruscan companions of Cælius Vibennus were established on the Cælian hill: hinc post Cælii mortem, quod nimis munita loca tenerent, neque sine suspicione essent, deducti videntur in planum. Ab eis dictus vicus Tuscus. De L. L. v. 46. Tacitus, in the passage cited above, p. 441, n. 105, speaks of Servius as being the author of the laws by which the powers of the Roman kings view of him to be reconciled with the character of his constitution, and with the account of the fraud practised upon the poorer citizens, to the advantage of the rich, given by Dionysius? If the classes of Servius were introduced in the place of a system, under which a perfectly equal suffrage existed for all ranks of citizens, he could not be justly regarded as a popular reformer.

Another difficulty connected with the Servian division of classes arises from its relation to the pay of the troops. With the exception of an allowance to the knights for the cost and maintenance of a horse (levied from a special property tax upon orphans and widows),(81) no pay for service in war was recognised by the constitution of Servius.(82) The disfranchisement of the poorer citizens and their exemption from military service, seem equally to be the consequences of their immunity from taxation; but when they began to receive pay, there was no reason why immunity from taxation should entail an exemption from military service.

It is highly probable that ancient records of the constitution of classes, by which the census and the suffrage were both regulated, existed in the office of the censors; and it may be assumed as certain that this system was, at a comparatively early period,

---

were limited; whereas before his time they were free from all constitutional check. Plutarch says of him: *Σέρβιος Τύλλιος, ἀνὴρ τῶν βασιλέων μάλιστα καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐξήσας τοῦ δήμου, καὶ τὸ πολίτευμα κοσμήσας*; ib. 10.

(81) Cic. Rep. ii. 20, speaks of this knight's allowance having been introduced by Tarquinius Priscus. He describes it as a Corinthian institution, and appears to connect it with Tarquin on account of his Corinthian origin. This is doubtless a mere guess, like the Lacedæmonian origin of the Sabines. Livy, i. 43, makes the allowance in question a part of the Servian institution of classes. See Becker, ii. 1, p. 251. Plutarch, Public. 12, says that this tax was remitted by Valerius Publicola.

(82) Livy says that the pay of troops was introduced in 406 B.C., and that the practice of the knights receiving pay, and furnishing their own horses, was introduced three years afterwards; iv. 59-60, v. 7; compare Diod. xiv. 16. Dionysius, speaking of the state of things under the constitution of Servius, says: *οὐ γὰρ ἐλάμβανον ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου τότε Ῥωμαῖοι στρατιωτικοὺς μισθοὺς ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἰδίοις τέλεσιν ἐστρατεύοντο*; iv. 19. Niebuhr conjectures that the pay of the troops began before the time assigned by Livy: vol. i. p. 474; vol. ii. p. 441; but his suppositions are inconsistent with the account of Dionysius as well as of Livy.

traced to Servius.(83) But there is nothing to authorize us in supposing that an authentic contemporary account of this division of classes had been preserved. The account followed by Cicero differs materially in the numerical arrangement of the centuries from that followed by Dionysius and Livy; and even the accounts of Dionysius and Livy, though substantially equivalent, differ in some subordinate points. The assessment for the first class is stated by Dionysius and Livy at 100,000 asses; but, according to Pliny, the sum was 110,000; while Festus and Gellius fix it at 120,000 and 125,000.(84) Livy states the assessment of the fifth class at 11,000 asses; Dionysius at 12,500; Cicero and Gellius at 15,000.(85) These discrepancies negative the idea of an official record, derived from the time of Servius himself: and they rather point to later accounts, referring to different periods, and perhaps deficient in precision. That there may have been some historical ground, resting on a faithful official tradition, for connecting the name of Servius with an arrangement of the census, is possible; but there is no sufficient reason for believing him to have been the author of the matured and complex system which is presented to us as his work, or for supposing that the authorship of it is ascribed to him in any other sense than that in which Romulus is said to have founded the Senate, Numa the ceremonial law, and Tullus Hostilius the law of the Fetiales.

---

(83) Aggrediturque inde ad pacis longe maximum opus: ut, quemadmodum Numa divini auctor juris fuisset, ita Servium conditorem omnis in civitate discriminis ordinumque, quibus inter gradus dignitatis fortunæque aliquid interlucet posteri famâ ferrent; Livy i. 42.

(84) Maximus census cx. mille assium fuit illo rege (Servio), et ideo hæc prima classis; Plin. H. N. xxxiii. 13. Classici dicebantur non omnes, qui in classibus erant, sed primæ tantum classis homines, qui centum et viginti quinque millia æris ampliusve censi erant; Gell. N. A. vii. 13. Festus (in the abridgment of Paulus) says: Infra classem significantur qui minore summâ quam centum et viginti millium æris censi sunt, p. 113, where Müller conjectures that *quinque* has fallen out of the text after viginti. The two last passages do not expressly refer to the Servian census; but there is no ground, without express testimony, for supposing that the assessment of the first class was raised. Compare Becker, ii. 3, p. 8. Polybius, vi. 23, appears to make the valuation of the first class in his time 10,000 drachmæ, or 100,000 asses; thus agreeing with Livy and Dionysius. See Boeckh, ib. p. 430.

(85) Cic. Rep. ii. 22: Gell. N. A. xvi. 10, § 10. The conjecture of Boeckh, ib. p. 429, that the extant numbers of the Servian assessment have been altered in consequence of the lowering of the Roman standard, and his attempt to restore the original scheme, founded upon an arbitrary selection of numbers from different writers, and on an assumption of numerical symmetry, are too uncertain to serve as the support of any historical inference. His hypothesis is rejected by Goettling, ubi sup. p. 247.

§ 29 Servius is further described (in imitation, according to Dionysius, of the Amphictyonic confederacy) as having established a league with the Latin cities, and a federal festival, to be held annually at the temple of Diana on the Aventine, which he himself founded. The conditions of this league, and the laws of the festival, were inscribed by him on a brazen column, which was still preserved in the temple in the Augustan age, and was examined by Dionysius.(86) Some large horns of an ox remained for many years fixed in front of this temple, with which a sacred legend was connected, assigning the supremacy over the Latin cities to Rome.(87) Servius was likewise the reputed founder of two temples of Fortune; one in the Forum Boarium, the other near the Tiber, dedicated to Fors Fortuna. In the former of these was an antique gilt wooden statue, which had been miraculously spared, when the other ornaments of the temple were destroyed by fire; and it was an object of much veneration (like an old image of the Madonna, or a saint) in the time of Dionysius.(88)

---

(86) Dion. Hal. iv. 26. *ἵνα δὲ μηδεὶς χρόνος αὐτοὺς ἀφανίσῃ, στήλην κατασκευάσας χαλκῆν ἔγραψεν ἐν ταύτῃ τά τε δόξαντα τοῖς συνέδροις, καὶ τὰς μετασχούσας τῆς συνόδου πόλεις. αὕτη διέμεινεν ἡ στήλη μέχρι τῆς ἐμῆς ἡλικίας ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῷ κειμένη, γραμμάτων ἔχουσα χαρακτῆρας Ἑλληνικῶν, οἷς τὸ παλαιὸν ἡ Ἑλλὰς ἐχρᾶτο.* This inscription was doubtless of great antiquity, and contained a list of the towns of the Latin league, and the rules of the federal festival; but there is nothing to show that the name of Servius occurred in it. Dionysius means that it was written in Greek characters, not in the Greek language. Livy, i. 45, and Victor de Vir. Ill. 7, who describe the foundation of this temple, say that Servius imitated it from the temple of the Ephesian Diana. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 450. A festival was connected with the dedication-day of this temple; Festus, p. 343. Servorum dies festus vulgo existimatur Idus Aug. quod eo die Servius Tullius, natus servus, ædem Dianæ dedicaverit in Aventino. Plut. Quæst. Rom. 100, says that it was the birthday of Servius. See above, p. 143.

(87) Livy, ib.; Val. Max. vii. 3. § 1; Victor de Vir. Ill. 7; Plut. Quæst. Rom. 4. The account of the latter is the most detailed; the fraud practised on the sacrifice of the ox is there stated to have been devised by Servius himself.

(88) Dion. Hal iv. 27. The foundation of the temple of Fors Fortuna is also ascribed to Servius by Varro, L. L. vi. 17; Livy. x. 46; Ovid, Fast.

The military exploits of Servius are not recounted in detail; but he is described as having defeated the entire nation of the Etruscans, after a war of twenty years; and as having treated them with lenity and magnanimity. He contents himself with requiring them to renew the treaty made with the late king Tarquin, and with mulcting of a portion of their territory three towns (Cære, Tarquinii, and Veii), which had been the authors of the revolt.(89)

§ 30 We now approach the close of this reign. Servius had two daughters, whom, in order to strengthen his power, he had married to the two sons of the late king.(90) It happened, however, that one of the Tarquins was of a good, and the other

---

vi. 765-76. Plutarch, de Fort. Rom. 10, however states that Ancus Marcius, the fourth king, was the founder. A statue of Fortune, which was said to have existed at Rome in the reign of Servius Tullius, was taken by Sejanus to his house, and treated with great honour; Dio Cass. lviii. 7. The other temple of Fortune at some time took fire, and everything in it was destroyed, except a gilt wooden statue of Servius; which, in the time of Dionysius, retained its ancient appearance when the other ornaments of the temple bore the marks of modern restoration, and was much venerated by the Romans; Dion. Hal. iv. 40. Above, p. 107.

> Arserat hoc templum; signo tamen ille pepercit
> Ignis; opem nato Mulciber ipse tulit.—Ovid, Fast. vi. 619-20.

Val. Max. i. 8, § 11, mentions this case, together with the lituus of Romulus, and a statue of Claudia, which twice escaped the flames. Pliny, viii. 74, states that the robes which Servius placed on the statue of Fortune, dedicated by himself, lasted until the death of Sejanus; and that they were not injured by moths, or other cause, during a period of 560 years, which places Servius at 529 B.C. (529+31=560) According to the received chronology, his death falls in 535 B.C. Concerning these two temples, compare Becker, vol. i. p. 478—481. The foundation of numerous temples of Fortune is ascribed to Servius by Plutarch; ibid. Servius is further said to have founded a temple to Mater Matuta:—

> Hac ibi luce ferunt Matutæ sacra Parenti
> Sceptriferas Servi templa dedisse manus.
> Ovid, Fast. vi. 479-80.

Compare Livy, v. 19, 23; Plut. Cam. 5. He is also mentioned by Tacitus, Ann. xv. 41, as the founder of a temple to the moon. See Becker, vol. i. p. 456.

(89) Dion. Hal. iv. 27; Livy, i. 42; Cic. Rep. ii. 21. Livy evidently conceives the war as of short duration, and thus differs from Dionysius.

(90) Livy says that Servius married his two daughters to the two Tarquins, in order to prevent their feeling to him being like that of the sons of Ancus to Tarquinius Priscus: 'Nec rupit tamen fati necessitatem humanis consiliis, quin invidia regni etiam inter domesticos infida omnia atque infesta faceret;' i. 42.

of a wicked disposition; and that there was a similar difference in the two daughters of Servius. It happened, likewise, whether by accident or design,(91) that the good Tarquin was married to the wicked Tullia, and the wicked Tarquin to the good Tullia.(92) By an elective affinity the two wicked ones are drawn together, and reverse the unsuitable arrangement of the double marriage; each murder their respective partners, and are joined in an unholy wedlock;(93) they then plot against the aged king, and take measures for removing this obstacle to their ambition. Tullia is represented as instigating her husband, and reproaching him with his hesitation and pusillanimity. In this Roman tragedy, she sustains the part of Lady Macbeth, with the additional circumstance of unfeminine ferocity—that the aged king is her own father.(94)

---

(91) Servius Tullius filiam alteram ferocem, mitem alteram habens, quum Tarquinii filios pari animo videret, ut omnium mentes morum diversitate leniret, ferocem miti, mitem feroci in matrimonium dedit; Victor de Vir. Ill. 7.

(92) According to Dion. Hal. iv. 28, Lucius, the elder Tarquin, who is bad, marries the elder Tullia, who is good; while Aruns, the younger Tarquin, who is good, marries the younger Tullia, who is bad. Livy, i. 46, differs as to the sisters; he makes Tullia minor the good one, and the wife of Lucius; while Tullia major is the bad one, who murders her husband Aruns. Victor attempts to soften the crimes of the bad Tarquin and the bad Tullia: '*Sed mites seu forte seu fraude* perierunt; feroces morum similitudo conjunxit;' c. 7.

(93) In the speech in which Brutus is represented by Dionysius as describing the atrocious acts committed by Tarquin, a passage occurs which resembles the well-known verses in Hamlet, on the marriage of the king to his brother's widow:—

The funeral baked meats
But coldly furnished forth the marriage tables:

πρὶν ἢ μαρανθῆναι τὰς ὑποδεξαμένας τὰ δυστηνὰ σώματα πυρὰς, φίλους εἱστία, καὶ γάμους ἐπετέλει, καὶ τὴν ἀνδροφόνον νύμφην ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς ἀδελφῆς θάλαμον ἤγετο; iv. 79.

(94) In Dionysius, the wicked Tullia is represented as asking for a private interview with L. Tarquin, in which she makes him a long speech, urging him to murder his wife and her own sister, as a step to the throne. This speech concludes with the following words: *καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν τἄλλα τις ἀδικεῖν ὀκνῇ, βασιλείας γε χάριν οὐ νέμεσις ἅπαντα τολμᾶν*, i. 29. The passage is closely imitated from two celebrated verses of Euripides, which Julius Cæsar was in the habit of repeating:—

εἴπερ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρὴ, τυραννίδος πέρι
κάλλιστον ἀδικεῖν, τἄλλα δ' εὐσεβεῖν χρεών.
Phœniss. 524-5.

See Suet. Cæs. 30: Cic. de Off. iii. 21.—Ovid likewise has described the solicitations of Tullia in some forcible verses:—

At this point of the narrative, Dionysius interposes a correction of another chronological error of Fabius, who stated that Aruns Tarquinius was buried by his mother Tanaquil; whereas, Tanaquil, according to the calculation of Dionysius, must have been 75 years old when Tarquinius Priscus died, and the death of Aruns was placed in the Roman annals in the fortieth year of Servius; so that she would have been 115 years old at this time, if she was still alive.(95)

Dionysius next describes L. Tarquin as forming a cabal against the king: and as being, in consequence, accused by him before the Senate. Tarquin retorts upon Servius by attacking the validity of his election, and by charging him with a wrongful invasion of his own hereditary rights. The king justifies his own conduct with respect to the guardianship, and proves that the kingly office is not hereditary. In answer to the charge of an invalid election he appeals to prescription, and reminds Tarquin that, if he had any substantive wrongs to allege, he ought to have brought them to a judicial decision. Nevertheless, he offers to resign the crown, and convenes the people, in order to address them on the subject. They receive him with applause, and refuse to hear the speech of Tarquin. His first attempt having failed, Tarquin entreats Servius to forgive him,

---

Tullia, conjugio, sceleris mercede, peracto,
  His solita est dictis exstimulare virum.
Quid juvat esse pares, te nostræ cæde sororis,
  Meque tui fratris, si pia vita placet?
Vivere debuerant et vir meus et tua conjux,
  Si nullum ausuri majus eramus opus.
Et caput et regnum facio dotale parentis;
  Si vir es, i, dictas exige dotis opes.
Regia res scelus est; socero cape regna necato,
  Et nostras patrio sanguine tinge manus.
Fast. vi. 581—90.

In the words 'regia res scelus est,' Ovid alludes to the murders of kinsmen, so frequent in royal families.

(95) Dion. Hal. iv. 30, who concludes with the reflection, in Thucydidean phrase: *οὕτως ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις αὐτοῦ τὸ περὶ τὴν ἐξέτασιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐνταλαίπωρον.* The annals to which Dionysius alludes are called by him *ἐνιαύσιαι ἀναγραφαί.* They must have been some chronological work, in which the events of the regal period were entered according to years. Concerning the former chronological error of Fabius, see above, p. 481.

and he is pardoned; but he watches for another more favourable opportunity, which occurs when most of the common people are gone into the country in order to gather in the harvest.(96) He then appears, in front of the Senate-house, in the royal dress, and with armed companions. He convenes the Senate, who assemble at his bidding; but Servius enters the hall, and orders him to withdraw. Tarquin, however, drives his aged father-in-law with violence out of the Senate-house, and throws him down the steps upon the ground. Before Servius can recover from this outrage and reach his house, Tarquin, at the suggestion of his wife, sends armed men to pursue him, who despatch him in the street. Tullia, exulting in the success of her parricidal counsels, orders her charioteer to drive the horses over her father's body; and the street in which this atrocious act was committed was ever afterwards known by the name of *Vicus Sceleratus*.(97) The hatred with which Servius is pursued is not appeased by his death. Tarquin will not allow him to be honoured with a public funeral. He is privately buried by his wife, who dies the next day, either by her own hands, or murdered by Tarquin and Tullia.(98)

---

(96) Dion. Hal. iv. 30—38. Livy knows nothing of these intermediate proceedings. He passes from the marriage of L. Tarquin with the wicked Tullia, to the murder of Servius; i. 47.

(97) Livy says that when Tullia had come to the top of the Cyprius vicus, and was turning to the right to the Virbius clivus, in order to go to the Esquiline, she came upon her father's body: Fœdum inhumanumque inde traditur scelus, monumentoque locus est: Sceleratum vicum vocant, quo amens, agitantibus furiis sororis ac viri, Tullia per patris corpus carpentum egisse fertur; i. 48. Dionysius states that the name of the street was changed from Orbius to Sceleratus, on account of this detestable act; iv. 39.

> Certa fides facti. Dictus Sceleratus ab illâ
> Vicus, et æternâ res ea pressa notâ.
>
> Ovid, Fast. vi. 603-4.

Prope hunc [vicum Cyprium] vicus Sceleratus, dictus a Tulliâ Tarquinii Superbi uxore, quod ibi quum jaceret pater occisus, supra eum carpentum mulio ut inigeret jussit; Varro de L. L. v. § 159. The same origin of the name is given by Victor de Vir. Ill. 7. There is also a mutilated article in Festus, p. 333. The act of Tullia is mentioned in Florus, i. 7. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 525—8.

(98) Dion. Hal. iv. 40. Livy states that Tarquin would not allow the body of Servius to receive *any* burial: Inde L. Tarquinius regnare occepit, cui Superbo cognomen facta indiderunt, quia socerum gener sepulturâ prohibuit, Romulum quoque insepultum perisse dictitans; i. 49.

§ 31 Although the reign of Servius is two centuries after the foundation of Rome, it is yet more than 300 years before the time of Fabius, and a century and a half before the burning of the city by the Gauls. The events referred to it present no trace of contemporary registration, or of a narrative derived from the testimony of well-informed witnesses. The accounts of the census, as has been already observed, though taken, directly or indirectly, from official and authentic sources, cannot be considered as ascending to the time of Servius; nor indeed can we be satisfied that the date of the inscription relating to the federal festival of the Latin towns, in the temple of Diana on the Aventine, was known with certainty. That a full contemporary account of the constitution of Servius, with statistical details of the assessment and obligations of the several classes, should have been preserved; and that all accurate memory of the other events of the reign should have perished,(99) is in the highest degree improbable. With respect to the internal evidence for the narrative portion of the reign, it does not stand higher than that of the previous part of the regal period. The legend of the birth and infancy of Servius is made up of marvels; the former part is obviously a mere etymological mythus, intended to furnish an explanation of the name *Servius*.(100) The legends which connect him with the temples of Diana and Fortune have no claim to historical truth; and the final tragedy

---

(99) Niebuhr says of Servius: 'The constitution attributed to him requires an explanation, which must be kept apart and removed without the circle of these legends;' vol. i. p. 367.

(100) The servile origin of Servius is often alluded to, thus Horace:

> Ante potestatem Tulli atque ignobile regnum.—Sat. i. 6, 9.

and Juvenal:—

> Ancillâ natus trabeam et diadema Quirini
> Et fasces meruit regum ultimus ille bonorum.—viii. 259-60.

The ides of August was also called the *servorum dies*, either because it was the birthday of Servius, or because he dedicated the temple of Diana on that day; Festus, p. 343; Plut. Quæst. Rom. 100. In Diod. x. 1, Tarquinius applies to Servius the reproachful epithet δουλέκδουλος—'a slave, the son of a slave,' (or a 'freedman.') A slave, who betrayed the Volscian town of Artena to the Romans, was made a Roman citizen, and received the name of Servius Romanus, according to Livy, iv. 61. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 714.

(which incidentally furnishes an origin for the name of the Vicus Sceleratus),(101) breathes a lofty and poetical spirit, but can hardly be considered as a recital of real facts. The chronological inconsistencies pointed out by Dionysius show that the relations of Servius to the Tarquinian family could not have been as they are described to us, and stamp the whole story with a legendary character.

We learn from a speech of the Emperor Claudius, preserved on a brazen tablet at Lyons, that, according to the Etruscan writers, Servius Tullius was not, as the Romans said, of Latin origin, but was an Etruscan, named Mastarna; that he was a companion of Cælius Vivenna, and followed his various fortunes; that he left Etruria with the remains of the army of Cælius, came to Rome, and settled on the Cælian hill, which hence derived its appellation; and that he afterwards changed his own name to Servius Tullius, and became king, to the great advantage of the state.(102) The Roman, however, as well as the Etruscan writers, had accounts of the arrival of Cælius or Cæles at Rome; some placed it in the time of Romulus, some in the time of Tarquinius Priscus, and others perhaps in other reigns.(103) He seems to be nothing more than the eponymous hero of the

---

(101) Livy, viii. 15, says that an open space near the Colline gate was called Campus Sceleratus, from an unchaste vestal having been buried alive there in the year 337, B.C. He speaks however with some doubt as to this origin of the name.

(102) Printed in several editions of Tacitus. See Schwegler, ib. p. 717. Varro, ib. and ap. Serv. Æn. v. 560, derives the Tuscus Vicus from Cælius Vibennus, who came to Rome in the time of Romulus. Propertius, iv. 2, 49, also refers the origin of the Tuscus Vicus to the reign of Romulus. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 495; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 507.

(103) Varro, L. L. v. 46, says that the Cælian hill was named from Cælius Vibennus, a Tuscan general, who came to the assistance of Romulus against Tatius. This Cælius is mentioned on the same occasion by Dion. Hal. ii. 36. A similar origin for the Cælian hill is given in Festus, p. 44. Tacitus leaves the matter in doubt between the time of Tarquinius Priscus and other kings: Haud fuerit absurdum tradere montem eum antiquitus Querquetulanum cognomento fuisse,—mox Cælium appellitatum a Cæle Vibennâ, qui dux gentis Etruscæ, cum auxilium appellatum ductavisset, sedem eam acceperat a Tarquinio Prisco, seu quis alius regnum dedit; nam scriptores in eo dissentiunt; Ann. iv. 65. In another mutilated article of Festus, p. 355. the name of the Tuscus Vicus seems to be derived from Cæles and Vibenna, two brothers, who came to Rome in the time of Tarquinius Priscus. See above, p. 423.

Cælian hill, and to be destitute of all historical character. We know nothing of the Etruscan authors from whom Claudius derived the account, and are therefore unable to judge of their credibility. It may proceed from an ancient and trustworthy, but on the other hand, it may be taken from a recent and tainted source. There is no reason for believing that the Etruscans possessed an authentic historical literature.(104)

A mention of the name of Servius Tullius can be traced (though not with entire certainty) in the Greek historian Timæus.(105) Timæus died about 256 B.C.; that is to say, about 280 years after the time fixed for the death of Servius; and if his name was known to Timæus, this carries the tradition higher up than the account of any Roman historian. We know, from the testimony of Dionysius, that Timæus wrote on the early Roman history.(106)

---

(104) Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 381—4, seems to doubt whether the account cited by Claudius is trustworthy. Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 117-8, admits it as historical. On the other hand, Goettling, Röm. Staatsverfassung, p. 232, denies its credibility. See above, p. 201.

(105) See above, ch. iii. § 12. Pliny has these words: Servius rex primus signavit æs: antea rudi usos Romæ Timæus tradit; N. H. xxxiii. 13. Elsewhere, Pliny says: Servius rex ovium boumque effigie primus æs signavit; xviii. 3. The former passage would, if strictly construed, imply that Timæus described the Romans as having used uncoined copper, for money, before the time of Servius. If so, he must have named Servius. It is however possible that Pliny found it stated in some Latin writer, that Servius was the originator of coined money at Rome, and that Timæus only reported that the early Romans used uncoined copper; out of which two statements he formed the passage above cited. The idea of Servius as the author of coined money at Rome was doubtless connected with his census: see Boeckh, Metrologische Untersuchungen, p. 161-2, 387. Thus Victor, de Vir. Ill. 7, says of him: Mensuras, pondera, classes, centuriasque constituit. On the other hand. Suetonius stated that Numa was the author of iron and copper money at Rome; above, § 13. 'It was a standard doctrine (says Col. Mure) of the popular Greek antiquaries, that every art or custom, even the most elementary, and such as could hardly fail to spring up simultaneously with the first efforts of a nation to emerge from barbarism, must have had some inventor, or, what is nearly equivalent, some importer from abroad. When the custom was one of recognised remote antiquity, the title to priority was usually awarded to some mythical hero;' Hist. of Gr. Lit. vol. iv. p. 55. Compare p. 101.

(106) i. 6. In the couplet cited above, p. 108, from Fast. vi. 617-8, Ovid seems to have made a numerical error, in calling Servius the seventh king. Virgil, in his enumeration of the Roman kings, Æn. vi. 778—818, omits Servius, though he mentions all the others.

§ 32 Tarquin having, by the murder of Servius, opened the way to the throne, assumes the kingly power without any legal forms; without the appointment of an interrex, the election of the people, or the confirmation of the Senate. He reigns by usurpation and force; and in the place of a constitutional royalty, he establishes a lawless despotism.(107) The measures attributed to him are similar to those used by the Greek despots, and enumerated by Aristotle as characterizing their mode of government. He surrounds himself with a bodyguard, who protect his person and palace; he secludes himself from intercourse with the citizens, and is harsh and haughty in his demeanour, whence he acquires the appellation of *Superbus*.(108) Having assumed the sole exercise of all capital jurisdiction, he puts many of the principal senators to death, and thus weakens the Senate: he repeals the popular laws of king Servius, and destroys the tablets on which they were inscribed; he likewise sets aside the Servian census, and its equitable mode of taxation, and imposes an equal tax of 100 asses on each citizen, without reference to his property: he suppresses all associations and fraternities among the citizens, and employs spies to watch and report their conduct; and he occupies the common people, in forced labour, for the construction of the Cloaca maxima, and in the completion of the Circus. He assumes to himself the entire powers of the state; all domestic affairs, and foreign relations, are governed by his sole will, without the consent of the Senate and people.(109)

---

(107) *εἰς ὁμολογουμένην τυραννίδα μετέστησε τὴν ἀρχήν*; Dion. Hal. iv. 41. Neque enim ad jus regni quidquam præter vim habebat, ut qui neque populi jussu neque auctoribus patribus regnaret; Livy, i. 49. Cicero, Rep. ii. 24, calls him an 'injustus et acerbus dominus;' and, in c. 25, describes him as governing by fear.

(108) Atque ille Tarquinius, quem majores nostri non tulerunt, non crudelis, non impius, sed superbus habitus est et dictus; Cic. Phil. iii. 4. *δυσπρόσοδός τε καὶ δυσπροσήγορος ἦν, καὶ τῇ ὑπεροψίᾳ τῇ τε ὠμότητι τοσαύτῃ πρὸς πάντας ὁμοίως ἐχρῆτο ὥστε καὶ ὑπερήφανος ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐπικληθῆναι*; Dio Cass. Fr. xi. 6. See above, n. 98.

(109) Dion. Hal. iv. 41-4; Livy, i. 49; Dio Cass. Fr. xi. 1-6. Compare Florus, i. 7. Sed ipse in senatum cædibus, in omnes superbiâ, quæ crudelitate gravior est bonis, grassatus, quum sævitiam domi fatigasset, tandem in hostes conversus est. The use of a bodyguard of foreigners, the

§ 33 Tarquin next appears in the character of founder of the Feriæ Latinæ. He had established an influence among the Latin towns, by marrying his daughter to Octavius Mamilius, a leading citizen of Tusculum, who traced his descent to Ulysses and Circe. Having convened a meeting of the Latin deputies at the Ferentine grove, near the Alban mount, he keeps them waiting for his arrival; and this delay gives Turnus Herdonius,(110) one of the deputies, an opportunity of inveighing against him in his absence. On the next day, Tarquin accuses him of treasonable designs against his colleagues, and supports his charge by the discovery of weapons, which he had caused to be concealed among the baggage of Turnus; this evidence seems conclusive, and Turnus is executed on the spot by a cruel death.(111) Afterwards, Tarquin renews the league with the Latin towns, in which Rome has the supremacy; and inscribes it on a column; he likewise institutes the Feriæ Latinæ, in

---

destruction of the rich citizens, the suppression of associations and meetings, the employment of spies, and the subjection of the people to forced labour for the erection of large public works, are enumerated by Aristotle among the measures characteristic of the Greek despotisms; Pol. v. 10, and 11. There is a confusion between the two Tarquins as to the construction of public works: the construction of cloacæ is attributed to Tarquinius Priscus; Dion. Hal. iii. 67; Livy, i. 38. Both of them were concerned with the Circus, and their respective shares in the building of the Capitoline temple are not clearly distinguished. Cassius Hemina, ap. Serv. Æn. xii. 603 (Krause, p. 159), says that when Tarquinius Superbus made the people work in the formation of sewers, and many hanged themselves on account of the severity of the labour, he ordered their bodies to be exposed on crosses; which caused suicide to be considered disgraceful. The same anecdote is given at length by Pliny, N. H. xxxvi. 24, § 3, but it is told of Tarquinius Priscus. Dio Cassius, Fr. xi. 6, states that Tarquinius Superbus caused some of the citizens to be bound naked to crosses, and afterwards to be flogged and put to death, in the Forum, and in the eyes of the people; and that this mode of punishment having been invented by him was afterwards often used. This seems to be another version of the same story. On the other hand, Cicero says: 'Supplicia in cives Romanos nulla Tarquinii accepimus;' Phil. iii. 4.

(110) Livy, i. 50, 51, calls him a citizen of Aricia; Dion. Hal. iv. 44, of Corioli (Κορίλλῃ, for Κοριόλῃ, or Κοριόλλῃ).

(111) εἰς βάραθρόν τι καταβάλλουσι, καὶ ἐπικατασκάψαντες ἔτι ζῶντι τὴν γῆν διαφθείρουσι παραχρῆμα; Dion. Hal. iv. 48. Ut novo genere leti, dejectus ad caput aquæ Ferentinæ, crate superne injectâ saxisque congestis mergeretur; Livy, i. 51. Compare Livy, iv. 50, where this mode of death is mentioned again, and Tacit. Germ. 12.

which forty-seven towns (including the towns of the Hernici, and two Volscian towns) participate.(112) On this occasion likewise the practice of forming mixed maniples of Romans and Latins, under a single centurion, was established.(113)

Strengthened by this alliance, Tarquin makes war upon the Sabines, and defeats them after a war of seven years; he afterwards turns his arms against the wealthy town of Suessa Pometia, in the country of the Volscians, which he takes and plunders.(114) With the tithe of the spoil of this city, which is said to have amounted to 400 talents(115), he built the temple of Capitoline Jupiter. In digging the foundations, a bloody head was found; which the Etruscan diviners interpreted to portend that Rome would be the head of all Italy; and hence the hill, previously called Tarpeian, received the name of Capitoline.(116)

---

(112) *ταύτας τὰς ἑορτάς τε καὶ τὰς θυσίας μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων τελοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι, Λατίνας καλοῦντες*; Dion. Hal. iv. 49. Dionysius, vi. 95, afterwards states that two days were added to the day originally instituted by Tarquin for the Feriæ Latinæ; but he speaks of the occasion of the original institution being a war against the *Etruscans*, which does not agree with the account in the fourth book. Cicero, Rep. ii. 24, describes Tarquinius Superbus as reducing the Latins, not by agreement, but by war: omne Latium bello devicit.

(113) See Livy, i. 52; Zon. vii. 10. Compare Livy, viii. 6.

(114) Suessa Pometia is called a colony of Alba (above, p. 363, note 32), and was probably at no great distance from Rome. See Cramer's Italy, vol. ii. p. 95; Abcken's Mittelitalien, p. 74. It certainly is different from Suessa Aurunca, to the south of the Liris, in the Campanian country. The Roman arms are not described as having reached so great a distance in the reign of Tarquin. Strabo, v. 3, § 4, speaks of Suessa, the metropolis of the Volsci, having been taken by Tarquinius Superbus. Cic. Rep. ii. 24, calls it a wealthy city.

(115) 400 talents, according to Dion. Hal. iv. 50. This sum was stated by Fabius; Livy, i. 55. L. Piso however raised it to 40,000 pounds of silver; ib. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 1135. For a statement respecting the application of the plunder of Apiolæ to the building of the Capitol, see above, p. 475, n. 18.

(116) Dion. Hal. iv. 59-61; Livy, i. 53-55; Cic. Rep. ii. 24; Florus, i. 7; Victor de Vir. Ill. c. 8; Zonaras, vii. 11. The story of the message to the Etruscan augurs about the bloody head, in Serv. Æn. viii. 345, is used as an explanatory legend for the name Argiletum. The head is here said to have belonged to a man named Olus; in order to make the word *capit-olium*. Pliny gives the name of Olenus Calenus to the Etruscan diviner; xxxviii. 4. The account of Pliny, Dionysius, and Zonaras, describes an attempt to divert the effect of the omen by a trick, as in the story of the ox's horns in the temple of Diana. Above, p. 502, note 87.

In Dio Cass. xi. 8, the response of the Etruscan diviner is that Rome

§ 34 At this time the town of Gabii becomes a refuge for Roman exiles, expelled by the tyranny of Tarquin, and for inhabitants of Suessa Pometia, whose city has been destroyed. It is besieged by a Roman force, but the siege is tedious, and the capture of the place is accelerated by the stratagem of Sextus Tarquinius, who feigns himself to have been maltreated by his father,(117) and thus induces the people of Gabii first to receive him as a refugee, and afterwards to intrust him with dictatorial power. Sextus now sends to his father for his advice, which is given by the symbolical answer of decapitating the tallest poppies.(118) Both of these very peculiar incidents are similar to stories recounted in Herodotus. The stratagem of Sextus resembles that of Zopyrus, by which Darius gained an entrance into Babylon.(119) The answer of Tarquin resembles that of Thrasybulus, the despot of Miletus, to Periander.(120) Sextus begins to follow this counsel by making a false accusation of treason against a distinguished citizen, named Antistius Petro; and he supports

---

will be the head of many nations, but by means of blood and slaughter. There is a similar legend with respect to Carthage. In digging the foundations on the first site which was chosen, an ox's head was found; this was thought to portend a wealthy, but a laborious and subject town: hence a new site was selected; and here a horse's head was dug up, which was considered the omen of a powerful and warlike city; Justin, xviii. 5. Compare Virgil:

> Quo primum, jactati undis et turbine, Pœni
> Effodere loco signum, quod regia Juno
> Monstrarat, caput acris equi; nam sic fore bello
> Egregiam, et facilem victu per secula gentem.
> Æn. i. 442-5.

According to Steph. Byz. in Καρχηδὼν, one of the names of Carthage was Κακκάβη, which meant 'horse's head' in the native language.

(117) This stratagem is mentioned in a fragment of Dio Cassius, xi. 7.

(118) Livy, i. 54; Dionysius, iv. 56, and Florus, i. 7, mention poppies. Ovid, Fast. ii. 704-5, substitutes lilies.

(119) See Herod. iii. 154. Livy, viii. 27, describes a similar stratagem as having been practised by some Lucanian youths, who had been bribed by the Tarentines, in the year 326 B.C. See also Dion. Hal. vii. 10.

(120) Herod. v. 92-6, where Thrasybulus is described as cutting off the heads of the tallest ears of corn. Aristotle, Pol. iii. 13, v. 10, by an error of memory, speaks of the advice as having been given by Periander to Thrasybulus. Compare Diog. Laert. i. § 100, where Menage mentions a conjecture of Petavius, that Tarquin, being of Corinthian origin, might have heard this advice from his predecessors. Dionysius points out the imitation of the story of Thrasybulus; c. 56; also Zonaras, vii. 10.

it by secreting forged letters in his house, a contrivance similar to that which his father had already practised against Turnus Herdonius. Having destroyed Petro and other leading citizens, he gives notice to his father, who surprises the town, and reduces it to submission, but treats it with unwonted lenity; spares the inhabitants and their property; and even admits them to the rights of Roman citizenship. These terms were reduced into writing, and were confirmed by mutual oaths. The record of the treaty was preserved at Rome, in the time of Dionysius, in the temple of Jupiter Sancus; it was in ancient letters, upon a bull's hide stretched upon a wooden shield. Tarquin then withdrew his army, having previously appointed his son Sextus king of Gabii.(121)

§ 35 The origin of the institution of the Sibylline books, for whose custody certain public officers were appointed, and which were consulted on critical occasions of religious alarm, is referred to this reign. A Sibyl is said to have offered them to Tarquin, and to have returned a first and a second time, having burnt a third portion after each visit, but always asking the original price, which she at last obtained.(122) That the Sibylline books were a national possession of peculiar sanctity, and that their antiquity was considerable, cannot be doubted; it is also highly probable that an account of their introduction was preserved among the pontifical records;(123) but that the account was contemporary with the event, we have no proof; and it is to be observed that in this, as in other cases, the legend fluctuates between the two Tarquins.(124)

---

(121) Dion. Hal. iv. 53-8; Livy, i. 53-4; Victor de Vir. Ill. 8; Florus, i. 7; Ovid, Fast. ii. 683—708; Zonaras, vii. 10. Livy does not mention on this occasion that Sextus Tarquin is made king of Gabii: but after the expulsion of the Tarquins, he says: Sex. Tarquinius Gabios, tanquam in suum regnum, profectus; i. 60.

(122) Dion. Hal. iv. 62, who relates the story at length, says that their original number was *nine*. Lactantius, Div. Inst. i. 6, gives the same number after Varro; as does Gellius, N. A. i. 19, citing the 'antiqui annales;' Serv. Æn. vi. 72, and Appian, H. R. i. 8. Pliny, N. H. xiii. 27, on the other hand, says: 'Inter omnes convenit Sibyllam ad Tarquinium Superbum tres libros attulisse; ex quibus igni duo cremati ab ipsâ, tertius cum Capitolio Sullanis temporibus.' Solinus, ii. 17, and Lydus, de Mens. i. v. 34, have only three books. Zonaras, vii. 11, mentions both numbers. Suidas, in Σίβυλλαι, says that the Cumæan Sibyl brought nine books of her own prophecies to Tarquinius Priscus, king of Rome, and that when he refused them, she burnt two books. The price mentioned in Lactantius and Servius is 300 pieces of gold: in Lydus it is thirty. Compare Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, p. 245—90.

The foundation of two colonies, Signia and Circeii, is likewise referred to this reign. Circeii is said to have been chosen on account of its position: Signia to have been originally a fortified camp, which became a permanent city.(125) The latter appears to be an etymological legend, from the word *signa*.

§ 36 The reign of Tarquin was now drawing to a close, and its calamitous termination was foreshown by a remarkable prodigy. Some eagles had built their nest on the top of a palm-tree, which stood near the king's palace; but it was attacked by a flight of vultures, which destroyed the nest, killed the young eagles, and drove away the parent birds when they returned. Tarquin is described as having beheld this portent, but to have been unable to avert his fate.(126) Of the prodigies recounted in Livy, from the beginning of the Second Punic War, the great majority were real, though uncommon occurrences, such as meteoric lights, or monstrous births; but this omen must have been fictitious, for the palm-tree does not grow at Rome,(127) nor do either eagles or vultures ever appear in its neighbourhood.(128)

---

(123) See Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 503. Livy, iii. 10, speaks of a search in the Sibylline books in 461 B.C., but Niebuhr, ib. note 1120, discredits this statement.

(124) The majority of writers place the incident in the time of Tarquinius Superbus: but Lactantius, Lydus, and Suidas refer it to Tarquinius Priscus. Compare Klausen, p. 245, 250.

(125) Dion. Hal. iv. 63; Livy, i. 56. Signia is described by Livy, ii. 21. as having been recolonized a few years afterwards, 495 B.C.

(126) Dion. Hal. iv. 63; Zonaras, vii. 11.

(127) Dr. Rothman, in his Observations on the Climate of Italy (London, 1848), p. 6, says that Terracina is now the northern limit of the date-palm in Italy, with the exception of a convent garden at Rome, and a small tract of coast between Nice and Genoa. Pliny's account of the palm is that it is the native of a hot climate; that it grows in Italy, but only as a cultivated tree, and not in the wild state, and that it never bears fruit: N. H. xiii. 6. Dio Cassius, xlviii. 43, speaks of four palm-trees springing up miraculously in Rome near the temple of the Mother of the Gods, and in the Forum; but it is difficult to judge whether any such trees really existed. Palms in one of the Lipari islands are mentioned in Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. 132. The snake of Æsculapius climbs up a palm-tree at Antium, in the marvellous story in Val. Max. i. 8, 2.

The siege of Ardea is the event upon which the expulsion of the Tarquins is described as turning. While the Roman army is encamped before this town, Sextus Tarquinius makes an excursion to Collatia, where he sees Lucretia, apparently for the first time,(129) though she is the wife of his kinsman, L. Tarquinius Collatinus, the son of Egerius, who had come with his brother Lucumo from Tarquinii to Rome.(130) The occasion of this visit is differently related. According to Dionysius, S. Tarquin was sent to Collatia on a message connected with some military object, and was lodged at the house of his cousin Collatinus, who remained at the camp. He took advantage of the husband's absence to enter the chamber of Lucretia at night, and to commit the celebrated outrage which led to the expulsion of the Tarquinian family from Rome, and to the abolition of the royalty. Livy, Dio Cassius,(131) and Ovid, describe the event as originating in a dispute between S. Tarquin and Collatinus, while they are carousing in the camp at Ardea, respecting the merits of their respective wives; in order to decide the question by ocular proof, and to surprise their wives by an unexpected visit, they hasten to Rome on horseback.(132) When they reach the palace, the wife of S. Tarquin is feasting and drinking; but when they proceed to Collatia, Lucretia is sitting up at night, spinning with her maids.(133) Having accomplished this juvenile excursion, they return to the camp; but shortly afterwards, Sextus Tarquin goes privately to Collatia, and having been hospitably received in the house of Collatinus, he ravishes the wife of his absent host.

---

(128) See above, pp. 390, 407, 471.

(129) Dionysius indeed describes S. Tarquinius as having previously wished to violate the chastity of Lucretia—*παλαίτερον μὲν ἐπειγόμενος, ὁπότε κατάγοιτο παρὰ τῷ συγγενεῖ*; iv. 64. Livy, i. 57, and Ovid, Fast. ii. 759—80, however evidently represent his love as the result of the visit from Ardea. Dio Cassius, Fr. xi. 15, and Zonaras, vii. 11, say that Tarquin was stimulated rather by her reputation for chastity than by her beauty.

(130) This was the statement of Fabius: but Dionysius, seeing that it cannot be reconciled with the chronology, conjectures that he was the *grandson* of Egerius; iv. 64. See above, p. 485, n. 48. Livy, i. 57, calls Collatinus the son of Egerius.

(131) Dio Cass. Fr. xi. 13-19.

(132) Both Livy and Ovid describe the journey to Rome as a momentary affair. Ardea however was twenty-four miles from Rome; and if, as Livy supposes, Lucretia was at Collatia, there was a further distance of ten miles to be travelled over. Servius, Æn. viii. 616, agrees with Livy as to the dispute about the wives. According to him, Aruns Tarquin and Collatinus ride together to Collatia, where they see Lucretia, and afterwards go to the house of Aruns (at Rome). Aruns afterwards gains admission to the house of Collatinus by a forged letter.

After the act of Tarquin, Lucretia is described by Dionysius as repairing to her father, Sp. Lucretius Tricipitinus, at Rome, and as stabbing herself in his presence.(134) According to Livy, she sends to her father at Rome, and to her husband before Ardea, to come to her at Collatia, each bringing with him a friend. They obey her summons, accompanied respectively by Valerius and Brutus. She then kills herself before them, and Brutus, holding up the dagger, vows vengeance upon the whole Tarquinian race.(135)

§ 37 L. Junius Brutus, who comes forward for the first time on this occasion, is, like Collatinus, nearly related to the royal family. His father, Junius, had married the king's sister;(136) but Tarquin had, from motives of jealousy, put him and his eldest son, Marcus, to death.(137) The younger son, Lucius, fearing a similar fate, simulated idiocy, and hence acquired the name of *Brutus*.(138) On one occasion, the palace having been alarmed by the prodigy of a serpent, two of the king's sons, Titus and Aruns, were sent to consult the oracle of Delphi, and Brutus went as their companion. He outwitted his colleagues in this mission, by the contrivance of the gold concealed in a hollow stick,(139) and by the interpretation of the ambiguous oracle, which promised the supreme power at Rome to whoever should first kiss his mother.(140)

---

(133) *Nocte serâ* deditam lanæ inter lucubrantes ancillas in medio ædium sedentem inveniunt, says Livy, i. 57. Also Ovid:

> Inde cito passu petitur Lucretia: nebat;
> Ante torum calathi lanaque mollis erant.
> *Lumen ad exiguum* famulæ data pensa trahebant.
> Fast. ii. 739—41.

It was a mark of the industrious Italian housewife to prolong her spinning labours, and those of her slave-women, into the night, as is shown in the touching lines of Virgil:

> Inde ubi prima quies medio jam noctis abactæ
> Curriculo expulerat somnum; quum femina primum,
> Cui tolerare colo vitam tenuique Minervâ
> Impositum, cinerem et sopitos suscitat ignes,
> *Noctem addens operi; famulasque ad lumina longo*
> *Exercet penso*, castum ut servare cubile
> Conjugis, et possit parvos educere natos.
> Æn. viii. 407—13.

(134) Dion. Hal. iv. 66-7.

(135) Livy, i. 58; Ovid, Fast. ii. 813-4. Servius, Dio Cassius, and Zonaras, vii. 11, agree with Livy, in describing Lucretia as sending for her father and husband. Diodorus, x. 49, says nothing of the dispute about the wives, but represents Sextus as going to Collatia, and being entertained at his kinsman's house. After the departure of Sextus, she sends for her relations, and kills herself.

---

(136) Dionysius says that Tarquinia, the mother of L. Junius Brutus, was the daughter of Tarquinius Priscus; iv. 68. According to his view, therefore, she would be the aunt, not the sister, of Tarquinius Superbus. Livy, i. 56, and Dio Cassius, xi. 10, however, call her the sister of Tarquinius Superbus. Dionysius says that Junius was a descendant of one of the companions of Æneas. Diod. x. 51, calls him the king's nephew.

(137) Dion. Hal. iv. 68; Zon. vii. 11. Livy, i. 56, and Victor, de Vir. Illustr. 10, only mention the murder of the elder brother.

(138) *εἴη δ' ἂν ἐξερμηνευόμενος ὁ Βροῦτος εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν διάλεκτον, ἠλίθιος*, Dion. Hal. iv. 67. *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Βροῦτος ἐκλήθη. τοὺς γὰρ εὐήθεις οὕτω πως οἱ Λατῖνοι προσηγόρευον*; Dio Cass. xi. 10, repeated by Zon. vii. 11. Ergo ex industriâ factus ad imitationem stultitiæ, quum se suaque prædæ esse regi sineret, Bruti quoque haud abnuit cognomen; ut *sub ejus obtentu cognominis* liberator ille populi Romani animus latens opperiretur tempora sua; Livy, i. 56. Compare Vict. de Vir. Ill. c. 10; Ovid, Fast. ii. 835; Plut. Publ. 3. Nonius, ii. 75, explains *brutus* by *hebes*, *obtusus*, citing an instance from Pacuvius, in whose remains two other examples of the same use of the word occur, v. 176, 366, 371, in Ribbeck's edition of the Latin tragedians. Compare Lucret. iii. 544. The common phrase *bruta animalia* means stupid animals, animals devoid of sense and intelligence, *τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα*: see Plin. N. H. xiii. 70. According to Festus, p. 31, *brutus* was anciently equivalent to *gravis*; upon which Müller remarks: 'De honestiori illo significatu, quo antiqui Romani eo vocabulo utebantur, solus Verrius tradidisse videtur. Hinc confutatur omnis illa fabula de M. Junii Bruti stupore.' Dr. Arnold takes a similar view: 'It is very possible that its early signification, as a cognomen, may have differed very little from that of Severus. When the signification of 'dulness' came to be more confirmed, the story of Brutus' pretended idiotcy would be invented to explain the fact, of so wise a man being called by such a name.' Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 104. But *brutus* seems to be equivalent to *gravis*, only in the sense of *heavy*, *sluggish*, *inert*. Thus Horace speaks of 'bruta tellus,' the motionless earth; Carm. i. 34: where the old Schol. says: 'Bruti graves et tardi dicuntur, quod terræ perpetuum est.'

(139) Dion. Hal. iv. 69, calls it a *βακτηρία ξυλίνη*. Livy, i. 56, says: Aureum baculum inclusum *corneo* cavato ad id baculo tulisse donum Apollini dicitur. Dr. Arnold renders this passage as follows: 'So when he went

The remaining events, up to the expulsion of the Tarquins, are related with substantial agreement, though with wide discrepancies in details, by Livy and Dionysius. According to the former, Brutus, having laid aside his simulated folly, rouses the inhabitants of Collatia, and marches to Rome with an armed band. Here, as Tribune of the Celeres, he convenes an assembly of the people, who, under the influence of his fervid appeal, pass a decree, abolishing the rule of Tarquin, and banishing him and his family. Brutus then hastens to Ardea, in order to obtain the concurrence of the army, leaving Lucretius as prefect of the city.(141) Tarquin and two of his sons go as exiles to Cære, and Tullia escapes; but Sextus, who takes refuge in Gabii, and attempts to resume his kingly power in that town, is put to death by the citizens, in retaliation for his former outrages. L. Junius Brutus and L. Tarquinius Collatinus are created consuls, in the Comitia of the centuries, by the prefect of the city, in accordance with the regulations found among the papers of

---

to Delphi, he carried with him *a staff of horn;*' Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 101. But *corneus* in Livy is the adjective of *cornus*, not of *cornu*. The cornel-tree was used for the shafts of spears, and therefore was fitted for such a staff as is here described. See Georg. ii. 457. Victor, de Vir. Ill. 10, calls it a *baculus sambuceus;* i.e. an elder stick, in which there is much pith, so that it could easily be hollowed. Compare Dio Cass. xi. 10, 12.

(140) See Dion. Hal. iv. 68-9; Livy, i. 56; Cic. Brut. 14; Victor, de Vir. Ill. c. 10; Dio Cass. xi. 12. The prediction of the oracle alludes to the subsequent consulship of Brutus. Cicero, Rep. ii. 24, speaks of Tarquinius Superbus sending magnificent gifts to Apollo of Delphi. According to Zonaras, vii. 11, the response brought from Delphi was, that Tarquin would be driven from his throne when a dog spoke with a human voice: an event which he thought would never occur. Pliny, N. H. viii. 63, says: Canem locutum in prodigiis (quod equidem adnotaverim) accepimus; et serpentem latrasse, cum pulsus est regno Tarquinius. In this passage, however, the barking of the serpent appears to be alone connected with the expulsion of Tarquin. The speaking of sheep and oxen often occurs in the Roman prodigies.

(141) The fact of Lucretius having been appointed by Tarquin prefect of the city, when he went to Ardea, is also mentioned by Dion. Hal. iv. 82; Tacitus, Ann. vi. 11, likewise speaks of Sp. Lucretius having been made prefect of the city by Tarquinius Superbus.

Servius Tullius.(142) According to the account of Dionysius, Lucretia kills herself at Rome, in the presence of her father, who sends P. Valerius to the camp. He is, however, met by Collatinus and Brutus, who are accidentally on their way to Rome. Brutus now throws off his assumed character, and stimulates the friends of Lucretia to vengeance. A debate is held, in which the course to be taken upon the expulsion of Tarquin is calmly discussed. Some, relying on the good administration of the previous kings, recommend the maintenance of the royal government, and therefore advise that no other change should be made than the substitution of a new king for Tarquin. Some, adverting to the evils of a monarchical regimen, think that the Senate should be supreme, as in many of the Greek cities; while others prefer a democracy, upon the model of Athens.(143) Brutus, however, decides the question by rejecting all these propositions, and by indicating the double line of kings in Lacedæmon as the advisable pattern. He counsels however that the two supreme magistrates should be called not kings but consuls; that they should use only a portion of the royal insignia; and that, like the Athenian archons, their office should be annual; moreover, that in order to preserve the royal title, a permanent King of the Sacrifices should be constituted, whose functions should be purely religious. These propositions are adopted, whereupon Brutus, as Tribune of the Celeres,(144) convenes an assembly of the curiæ, and, having addressed them in a long harangue, in which he recounts the tyrannical acts of the king, he obtains decrees for the perpetual banishment of the Tarquinian family, and for the appointment of two annual consuls. Brutus then nominates Sp. Lucretius as interrex, who convenes the centuries to the Campus Martius, where Brutus and Collatinus are duly elected to the consular office. Letters are next sent to T. Herminius and M. Horatius at the camp, where the army consent to the measures adopted in the city. A fifteen years' truce is made with Ardea, and the siege is raised. In the meantime, Tarquin, rejected both by the city and army, escapes with a few followers to Gabii, but soon afterwards takes refuge in the Etruscan town of Tarquinii, with which he had a hereditary connexion.(145)

---

(142) i. 59-60.

(143) It should be observed that the date assigned for the expulsion of the Tarquins is almost exactly coincident with that of the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ, as Pliny, N. H. xxxiv. 9. remarks. At this time the Athenians had had little experience of a democratic government.

(144) Both Livy and Dionysius speak of Brutus as Tribune of the Celeres. Pomponius, § 15, says that this was the chief office in the state next to the kings. He compares it with the master of the horse under the dictator; § 19. It must not however be supposed that these notices are authentic. Dr. Arnold remarks:—'It is hardly necessary to point out the extravagance of the story, in representing Brutus, though a reputed idiot, yet invested with such an important office:' Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 104. Dionysius however attempts to obviate this objection by saying, that Tarquin gave him the office, believing that he would not discover its powers, or if he did, that he would not use them; iv. 71. Livy and Dionysius agree

§ 38 The narrative of the reign of Tarquinius Superbus so far differs from that of the former kings, that there is a much closer agreement between Livy and Dionysius, and more appearance of a fixed version of the events in the different writers from which they drew their accounts. But there is nothing which leads to the inference that the materials from which the narrative is constructed were derived from contemporary registration, or were written down from fresh and authentic oral traditions, like the account of the Pisistratidæ in Thucydides. The interval which separated the historian Fabius from this reign is as great as that which separated Hermippus or Phylarchus from the time of the Pisistratidæ. The inscription which recorded the treaty between Rome and Gabii, still extant in the time of Dionysius, was doubtless ancient; but whether it named Tarquin, or contained, within itself, any indication of its date, is uncertain.

With respect to the internal evidence, we may first remark

---

in saying that Brutus was sent to Delphi as a companion to Titus and Aruns, in order that he might amuse them by his folly; Livy, i. 56; Dion. Hal. iv. 69.

(145) Dion. Hal. iv. 70—85, v. 3; Zonaras, vii. 11, describes Brutus as personally rousing both the city and the army. He likewise states that Tarquin and all his family fled to Tarquinii, with the exception of Tullia, who killed herself.

that the chronology is not consistent with itself. The life of Tarquinius Superbus, as we have already seen,(146) is extended to an impossible length, if we suppose him to have been the son of Tarquinius Priscus, and to have died at Cumæ in 496 B.C. The same may be said of Collatinus; and Brutus, who is described as a boy at the beginning of the reign of Tarquinius Superbus, and a young man at its termination, appears immediately after the expulsion of the kings with two grown-up sons.(147)

The story of the meeting of Latin deputies is sufficiently credible (with the exception perhaps of the contrivance by which they are persuaded to condemn their colleague, Turnus Herdonius); but it appears in the suspicious form of an introduction to the origin of the Feriæ Latinæ. The amicable arrangement, moreover, by which Tarquin establishes the ascendancy of Rome over Latium, is quite inconsistent with the view of Cicero, who describes him as subduing the whole of Latium by force of arms. The accounts of public works attributed to him are not distinct; the execution of the Cloaca maxima, and the stories connected with it, fluctuate between him and the other Tarquin; the shares of the two kings in the erection of the Capitoline temple are not clearly separated; and the story of the bloody head, and of the prophecy of the greatness of Rome, betray at once their legendary origin. The celebrated and striking story of the Sibyl and her volumes of prophecies is again nothing more than a fabulous origin of the sacred Sibylline books, which were consulted on great occasions of state; in this likewise, as in other cases, there is a fluctuation between the two Tarquins. The entire account of the reduction of Gabii is improbable, with the borrowed stories of Sextus Tarquin's self-inflicted punishment, and the decapitation of the poppies; nor can the treaty described by Dionysius be reconciled with the fraudulent and forcible means used by Tarquin for its acquisition, or with the subsequent appointment of his son as king of the town.(148)

---

(146) Above, p. 481.

(147) Livy, i. 46; Dion. iv. 68-9. See Schwegler, i. 1, p. 50. Bayle, Dict. Art. Tanaquil, note G, likewise shows that the statement of Dionysius, that Tarquinia, the mother of Brutus, was the daughter of Tarquinius Priscus (iv. 68), is not consistent with the chronology, and is liable to his own objections with respect to the parentage of Tarquinius Superbus. Dionysius does not however expressly state, what Bayle attributes to him, that the mother of Brutus was the daughter of Tanaquil, though he may imply it.

The prodigy of the eagles building on a palm-tree, and their expulsion by a flock of vultures, must be set down as fiction; but the story of Lucretia, though it has a romantic cast, might be substantially true; nor would there be any good reason for questioning its reality, if it came to us authenticated by fair contemporary evidence. The true story of the suicide of Arria; who, when she had stabbed herself, gave the dagger to her husband, with the celebrated words, *Pæte, non dolet*;(149) is not more improbable than the suicide of Lucretia; though the description of Brutus brandishing the bloody dagger, and holding it in his hand while he swears vengeance against the Tarquins, savours of theatrical effect.(150) That outrages upon women were often the causes of the overthrow of Greek despotisms, we are expressly told by Aristotle;(151) and a similar act is reported to have provoked the resistance which put an end to the arbitrary rule of the Roman Decemvirs.(152) Even if the rape of Lucretia was not the true cause of the expulsion of the Tarquins, it might, as in the corresponding story of Harmodius and Aristogiton, have been a real event, which was misplaced and magnified by popular rumour. When however we come to examine the details of the story, we find little in its internal contexture to supply the defect of external attestation. The narratives of Dionysius and Livy, though agreeing in substance, differ in many material circumstances. The dispute of the young men about their wives, and their nocturnal ride to Rome and Collatia, which is the foundation of the attempt of Sextus in Livy, is altogether wanting in Dionysius. In the latter, Rome is the place of Lucretia's suicide; in the former it is Collatia. Most of the accounts represent Tarquinius Superbus as having three sons, Sextus, Titus, and Aruns; but Livy and Ovid make Sextus, the ravisher of Lucretia, the youngest, while Dionysius says that he was the eldest of the three. Other writers again speak of Aruns as having ravished Lucretia.(153) There are further discrepancies in the events which intervene between the death of Lucretia and the expulsion of the Tarquins; Livy moreover represents the king and his family as escaping to Cære, with the exception of Sextus, who repairs to his kingdom of Gabii, where he is put to death. Dionysius, on the other hand, says that Tarquin first took refuge in Gabii, and afterwards removed to Cære.(154) Brutus acts the prominent part in the dethronement of Tarquin, and in the substitution of the consular for the royal form of government; accordingly, in the series of ancient statues of the Roman kings preserved on the Capitol, he stood in the centre, holding in his hand a drawn sword, in allusion to his character of a champion of liberty, and to the force which he had used for the expulsion of Tarquin.(155) The story of his assumed idiocy, and of the clever tricks which he plays with the oracle, seems however to have been suggested by his name, Brutus; the connexion of Tarquinius Collatinus, and of his father Egerius, with the town of Collatia, has likewise the appearance of having grown out of the name Collatinus.(156) These etymological legends point to a native origin of the narrative; on the other hand, the two stories from Herodotus, and the introduction of the Delphic oracle, upon so trivial an occasion as the sight of a snake, betray an inventor acquainted with Greek literature. The supposed anniversary of the Regifugium was celebrated in later times; and it may have been perpetuated by an authentic tradition, and a constant usage.(157) Otfried Muller, influenced apparently by the internal improbabilities of the story, expresses his opinion that the account of the overthrow of the Tarquinian rule is nothing but a collection of fables.(158) It is indeed possible that some fragments of true and authentic tradition may be preserved in the narrative which has come down to us; but we have no means of distinguishing them; we have no test by which we can separate the dross from the pure ore.

---

(148) 'It is quite impossible that Gabii should have fallen into the hands of the Roman king by treachery. Had such been the case, no one—I will not say no tyrant, but no sovereign in antiquity—would have granted the Roman franchise to the Gabines, and have spared them all chastisement by the scourge of war. . . . The very existence of a treaty, though reconcilable with the case of a surrender, puts the forcible occupation out of the question.' Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. p. 512.

(149) See Plin. Ep. iii. 16.

(150) Both Livy and Dionysius agree in this circumstance: Brutus cultrum ex vulnere Lucretiæ extractum, manantem cruore, præ se tenens, Per hunc, inquit, castissimum ante regiam injuriam sanguinem juro, vosque, dii, testes facio, me L. Tarquinium Superbum, cum scelerata conjuge et omni liberorum stirpe, &c., i. 59. ταῦτ' εἰπών, καὶ λαβὼν τὸ ξιφίδιον ᾧ διεχρήσατο ἑαυτὴν ἡ γυνή, καὶ τῷ στόματι προσελθὼν αὐτῆς, ὤμοσε τόν τ' Ἄρην καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς πάντα καθ' ὅσον δύναται πράξειν ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς Ταρκυνίου δυναστείας; iv. 70. Also Servius, Gladio se interemit, quem Brutus de ejus corpore extractum tenens processit ad populum.

(151) Aristotle specially advises the despot to abstain from offering violence to other men's wives: ὡς καὶ διὰ γυναικῶν ὕβρεις πολλαὶ τυραννίδες ἀπολώλασιν; Pol. v. 11, cf. 10; see also Polyb. vi. 7, 8.

---

(152) Valentinian III., emperor of the West, was killed out of revenge for his outrage to the wife of Petronius Maximus, 445 A.D. Gibbon, Decl. and Fall, c. 25. Compare the account of the suicide of Democles, in Plut. Demetr. 24.

(153) Sextus filius ejus, qui minimus ex tribus erat; Livy, i. 53. Titus and Aruns, the other two brothers, are mentioned as going to Delphi; c. 56. Aruns dies in single combat with Brutus; ii. 6. Namque trium minimus, proles manifesta Superbi; Ovid, Fast. ii. 689. Nam cum filius ejus, et ipse Tarquinius junior, nobilissimam feminam Lucretiam—stuprasset; Eutrop. i. 8. On the other hand, Dionysius states that Sextus, the ravisher of Lucretia, was the eldest son of Tarquin; iv. 63-4, 85. Cicero, Rep. ii. 25, says that it was the eldest son, without mentioning the name. Victor de Vir. Ill. 9, Diodorus, x. 49. 50, Dio Cassius, Fr. xi. 15, and Zonaras, vii. 11, merely mention Sextus. Florus, i. 7, appears to give only two sons to Tarquin, and he makes Aruns, the combatant with Brutus, also the ravisher of Lucretia; ib. 10. Servius, ad Æn. viii. 646, who relates the entire story at length, names Aruns as the offender, but merely saying that he was one of Tarquin's sons. Thucydides, vi. 54—9, shows that the popular belief of the Athenians, prevalent in his own time and afterwards, that Hipparchus, not Hippias, was the eldest son of Pisistratus, and succeeded him in the despotism, was erroneous; and that Hippias was really the successor. But this error was the natural growth of the other popular error, that the act of Harmodius and Aristogiton was the cause of the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ: for the brother whom they killed was Hipparchus, and not Hippias. In the case of the Tarquins, we have no means of explaining why the tradition fluctuated between the different brothers, or any ground for preferring one version to another.

---

(154) The differences between the narratives of Livy and Dionysius are set forth at length by Bayle, Dict. art. Lucrèce, note B.

(155) Ἰούνιος Βροῦτος, ὃν ἀνέστησαν ἐν Καπιτωλίῳ χαλκοῦν οἱ πάλαι Ῥωμαῖοι, μέσον τῶν βασιλέων, ἐσπασμένον ξίφος, ὡς βεβαιότατα καταλύσαντα Ταρκυνίους; Plut. Brut. i. Compare Dio Cass. xliii. 45: Pliny. N. H. xxxiii. 4, 6; xxxiv. 11, 13. They are mentioned by Appian, Bell. Civ. i. 16, as being in existence at the time of the Gracchi. Hence likewise the allusion of Virgil:

> Vis et Tarquinios reges, *animamque superbam*
> *Ultoris Bruti*, fascesque videre receptos.—*Æn.* vi. 818-9

Brutus is treated as the real author of the expulsion of the Tarquins, in the speech of Aruns Tarquin, Livy, ii. 6. See above, p. 107.

(156) The name Egerius is derived from *egeo*, because he inherited nothing from his father. The name of Collatinus is derived from his being made dictator of Collatia: Dion. Hal. iii. 50; iv. 64.

§ 39 Having completed our detailed examination of the historical evidence of the regal period, we may now briefly sum up the conclusions to which it appears to point. It may then be stated, as the result of this inquiry, that the narrative of Roman affairs, from the foundation of the city to the expulsion of the Tarquins, is formed out of traditionary materials. At what time the oral traditions were reduced into writing, and how much of the existing narrative was the arbitrary supplement of the historians who first framed the account which has descended to us, it is now impossible to ascertain. The most ancient materials for Roman history were doubtless (as indeed we may infer from Dionysius), unconnected stories, notes of legal usages, and of constitutional forms, and other entries in the pontifical books. These were the germs of Roman history; out of these fragments Fabius and his successors constructed the primitive annals of their country. The remains of *leges regiæ* (of which a few citations occur in ancient writers, and of which a collection is even said to have existed in later times) are nothing more than ancient records of this sort. It was easy for a pontifical scribe, who entered a rule of consuetudinary law in his register, to dignify it with the name of a *lex regia*, and to attribute it to Numa, Servius, or one of the other kings.(159) The same origin must likewise be assigned to the curious legal forms—such as the inauguration of the kings, the making of treaties, the appointment of capital duumvirs, the declaration of war, and the surrender of a city—which are preserved in the first book of Livy.(160) Private documents or papers of Numa and Servius are likewise mentioned by the same historian; but he does not say that they were preserved.(161) There is no trace of any authentic chronology of the regal period; the number of years assigned to each reign is large, although the kings are elective, most of them die a violent death, and the last king is dethroned.(162) Nevertheless, a detailed chronology for this period seems to have been fabricated by the Roman antiquaries;

---

(157) On the 24th of February; see Schwegler, vol. i. p. 779.

(158) Etrusker, vol. i. p. 387.

(159) See above, ch. v. § 5. Becker, vol. i. p. 13–6; Schwegler, i. 1, p. 23. The law of Numa respecting the spolia opima, cited in

---

Plut. Marcell. 8, agrees with the quotation in Festus, p. 189, if for *compelli reges* we read *Pompili regis*. Becker, vol. i. p. 13, is mistaken in saying that Festus quotes the law from the libri pontificii. In Festus, p. 273, l. 24, Müller appears to be right in substituting *nam* for *Numa*. The enactments concerning men struck with lightning, cited from the laws of Numa in Festus, p. 178, are considered by Müller, p. 391, to be taken from some work of late date. The accounts of the Papirian collection of royal laws (see Schwegler, ib. p. 24) are confused and inconsistent. There is no reason for supposing that it was anything more than a recent compilation of ancient rules of sacred law, to which the names of the kings were arbitrarily attached.

(160) See i. 18, 24, 26, 32, 38. Cicero expressly quotes the pontifical and augural books, for a point of constitutional law under the kings: Provocationem autem etiam a regibus fuisse, declarant pontificii libri, significant nostri etiam augurales; Rep. ii. 31. Compare Sen. Epist. 108, § 31. The rules for an appeal to the people from the king's judges in capital trials for homicide are given by Livy, i. 26. See above, p. 171.

(161) Livy, i. 32, says that Ancus Marcius collected the sacred institutions of Numa, 'ex commentariis regis,' transferred them to whitened boards, and exhibited them in public. Dionysius, iii. 36, gives the same account, but says that Ancus obtained these regulations from the priests. Livy, i. 60, states that the two first consuls were created, 'ex commentariis Ser. Tullii;' by which he means that the forms were observed which had been prescribed in the private papers of Ser. Tullius. This however was doubtless a fiction, founded upon his reputation as a popular king. For the use of *commentarii*, in the sense of private papers, see above, p. 169, note 121. In the passage of Cicero pro Rabir. 5: Cum iste omnes et suppliciorum et verborum acerbitates non ex memoriâ vestrâ ac patrum vestrorum, sed ex annalium monumentis atque ex regum commentariis conquisierit, the words *regum commentarii* mean documents of the regal period.

(162) The following is the chronology of the regal period 753—510 B.C., as given by Dionysius, i. 75:—

the extant triumphal Fasti record the triumphs of the kings; and Dionysius quotes the annals for the date of the death of Aruns Tarquinius in the reign of Servius.(163)

At what time the oral traditions relating to the period of the kings began to be reduced into writing, we are unable to determine. The records of them, which were made before the burning of Rome, 390 B.C., were doubtless rare and meagre in the extreme; and such as there were at this time chiefly perished in the conflagration and ruin of the city. It was probably not till after this period—that is to say, about 120 years after the expulsion of the kings—and above 350 years after the era assigned for the foundation of the city, that these oral reports—these hearsay stories of many generations—began to be entered in the registers of the pontifices.(164) Even when the registration began, it was doubtless principally employed about contemporary events; it had an annalistic character, and the history of the primitive time was not written till a later period.(165)

	Years.
Romulus	37
Interregnum	1
Numa Pompilius	43
Tullus Hostilius	32
Ancus Marcius	24
L. Tarquinius Priscus	38
Servius Tullius	44
L. Tarquinius Superbus	25
	244

Livy, i. 60, and other writers agree as to the sum. Cicero, de Rep. ii. 30, gives it in round numbers at 240 years. Eutropius has 243 years. See Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 15; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 806-8. The criticism of Sir Isaac Newton upon the long reigns of the Roman kings, is fully examined by Hooke, in his Remarks on the History of the Seven Roman Kings, prefixed to his Roman history. Compare Niebuhr, Hist. vol. i. n. 912.

(163) iv. 30. See above, p. 505, n. 95.

(164) 'The legends of the early Roman story are neither historical, nor yet coeval with the subjects which they celebrate. . . . . Of the Roman mind under the kings, Cicero knew no more than we do. He had seen no works of that period, whether of historians or of poets; he had never heard the name of a single individual whose genius had made it famous, and had preserved its memory together with his own.' Arnold, Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 97, 99.

(165) Schwegler, vol. i. p. 40, says that the history of the regal period

The history of the entire regal period, as respects both its external attestation and its internal probability, is tolerably uniform in its character. It is indeed more likely that the latter portion of this period of nearly two and a half centuries should have been preserved by a faithful oral tradition, until the time when the traditionary accounts were reduced to writing, than the early portion; but beyond this general presumption there is little to guide our judgment. Niebuhr indeed has drawn a broad line between the reigns of Romulus and Numa on the one hand, and those of the five last kings on the other. The former he considers to be purely fabulous and poetical; the latter he regards as belonging to the mythico-historical period; when there is a narrative resting on a historical basis, and most of the persons mentioned are real.(166) But it is impossible to discover any ground, either in the contents of the narrative, or in its external evidence, to support this distinction. Romulus,

---

was handed down, not merely for generations but even for centuries, by oral tradition. He considers it as possible, and even probable, that at the time of the Decemvirs (451—49 B.C.) the Romans knew nothing certain respecting the origin of their city. He thinks that the rape of Lucretia may be true, but that all the details of that event and of the overthrow of Tarquin are fictitious, and that the memory of the real circumstances which accompanied that catastrophe was extinct, when the annalists wrote; ib. p. 803-4. Mr. Newman, Regal Rome, p. 168-9, thinks that our accounts concerning the last three kings may be better trusted, but that the accounts of the earlier reigns are less trustworthy. He considers the reign of Numa as 'all but mythical;' but he holds that Tullus and Ancus may be real men. He conjectures that sixteen elective kings may have reigned in 200 years from Numa to Tarquin the Proud.

(166) 'With Tullus Hostilius we reach the beginning of a new secle, and of a narrative resting on historical ground, of a kind totally different from the story of the preceding period;' Hist. vol. i. p. 246. 'The death of Numa forms the conclusion of the first sæculum, and an entirely new period follows. . . . . Up to this point we have had nothing except poetry; but with Tullus Hostilius a kind of history begins—that is, events are related which must be taken in general as historical, though in the light in which they are presented to us they are not historical. Thus, for example, the destruction of Alba is historical, and so in all probability is the reception of the Albans at Rome. The conquests of Ancus Marcius are quite credible; and they appear like an oasis of real history in the midst of fables;' Lect. vol. i. p. 41. Compare above, p. 125, n. 101. Schwegler follows Niebuhr in holding that the two first reigns stand on a separate ground, and that history dawns with Tullus Hostilius; ib. p. 557-8, 579. As we have already seen, he thinks that some of the wars of Ancus are historical, and others fictitious. Above, p. 466, n. 187.

indeed, from the form of his name, appears to be a mere personification of the city of Rome, and to have no better claim to a real existence than Hellen, Danaus, Ægyptus, Tyrrhenus, or Italus. But Numa Pompilius stands on the same ground as the remaining kings, except that he is more ancient; and the narrative of all the reigns, from the first to the last, seems to be constructed on the same principles. That the names of the kings after Romulus are real, is highly probable;(167) during the latter reigns much of the history seems to be in the form of legendary explanations of proper names; this has been already remarked with respect to Servius, Egerius, Collatinus, and Brutus; and even with respect to the Tarquinian family, it may be doubted whether the similarity of their name to that of the city of Tarquinii was not the origin of the story of Demaratus and the Etruscan origin.(168) The circumstance that the two king Tarquins were both named Lucius, and that it was necessary to distinguish them by the epithets of Priscus and Superbus,(169) raises a presumption that the names were real. Müller indeed regards the names of the two Tarquins as merely representing the influence exercised by the Etruscan city of Tarquinii in Rome at the periods known as their reigns.(170) On the other hand, Schwegler considers their reigns to have been a period when the influence of Greek ideas and literature predominated at Rome;(171) and he conjectures that the name *Tarquinius* may be equivalent with *Tarpeius*, that this family derived their name from the Tarpeian hill, and that they were so denominated, in oral tradition, as being the 'Capitoline dynasty.'(172)

---

(167) Niebuhr, indeed, though he considers the reigns of the last five kings as mythico-historical, yet does not believe their names to be ascertained. 'The names of the kings (he says) are perfectly fictitious; no man can tell how long the Roman kings reigned, as we do not know how many there were;' Lect. vol. i. p. 41. 'Ancus and Tullus seem to me to be historical personages; but we can scarcely suppose that the latter was succeeded by the former, and that the events assigned to their reigns actually occurred in them;' ib. p. 47. 'For the sake of greater clearness, I shall here treat of Tarquinius Priscus and Servius Tullius as if they were historical personages, their names representing men who, though not known to us, really existed, and in fact serving the same purpose as x, the symbol of an unknown magnitude in mathematics;' Lect. vol. i. p. 69.

(168) See Schwegler, ib. p. 677, who considers the origin of the Tarquins from Tarquinii to be an etymological mythus. On the other hand, Mr. Newman, Regal Rome, p. 117, thinks that 'the account given by Livy and Dionysius of the origin of the elder Tarquin is simple, natural, every way credible.'

(169) Dion. Hal. iv. 41, remarks that Tarquin the elder ὁμώνυμος ἦν τῷ νεωτέρῳ κατ' ἄμφω τὰ ὀνόματα. Paul. Diac. p. 226: Priscus Tarquinius est dictus, quia prius fuit quam Superbus Tarquinius. Schwegler, p. 685, thinks that we ought to render this appellation not 'Tarquin the elder,' but 'Tarquin the ancient.' The question does not seem very important, provided it is admitted that the epithet is used to distinguish him from Tarquinius Superbus.

§ 40 The leading feature of the government during this period is that its chief was a king, who obtained his office by the election of the people, and the confirmation of the Senate, in the same manner in which consuls and other high magistrates were appointed after the abolition of royalty; but that, when once fully elected, he retained his power for life. In the mode of succession, the Roman differed from the early Greek kings, whose office was hereditary.(173) The Alban kings, likewise, to whom the Roman kings traced their origin, are described as succeeding by inheritance and not by election.(174) Romulus is represented by Dionysius to have deliberately instituted the method of appointing the king by the election of the people;(175) and Cicero expressly commends the sagacity of the Romans, in making their king elective, instead of committing the error of Lycurgus, according to whose institutions the kings of Sparta succeeded by the title of inheritance.(176)

---

(170) Etrusker, vol. i. p. 119. 'There are accounts (says Dr. Arnold) which represent all the last three kings of Rome, Servius Tullius no less than the two Tarquins, as of Etruscan origin. Without attempting to make out their history as individuals, it is probable that the later kings were either by birth or long intercourse closely connected with Etruria, inasmuch as at some early period of the Roman history the religion and usages of the Etruscans gave a deep and lasting colouring to those of Rome;' vol. i. p. 56.

(171) Vol. i. p. 679—84. (172) Ib. p. 696, note.

(173) *πρότερον δὲ ἦσαν ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς γέρασι πατρικαὶ βασιλεῖαι*; Thucyd. i. 13. So Aristot. Pol. iii. 14, defines the Greek heroic royalties as *ἑκούσιαί τε καὶ πάτριοι γιγνόμεναι κατὰ νόμον*.

(174) Compare Plut. Rom. 27; and on the succession from father to son, above, p. 369. The Lucanians are said by Strabo to have been governed by a democratic regimen in peace: but in war the ordinary electors created a king; vi. 2, § 3. This officer doubtless corresponded closely to the Roman dictator. The Veientes are described by Livy as creating a king on an extraordinary occasion; v. 1. Compare Müller, Etrusker, vol. i. p. 366. A dictator, or elected chief, with absolute imperium, was called by the Greeks *αἰσυμνήτης*. See Aristot. Pol. iii. 14.

(175) Dion. Hal. ii. 4, 6. Compare Becker, ii. 1, p. 294.

Although there is not a precise agreement as to the legal forms used in the election of the king, the following may be considered as the necessary stages in the process, according to the several accounts. 1 The appointment of an interrex, who convenes the popular assembly, and puts the question to the vote. 2 Election by the majority of the votes of the people in comitia curiata. 3 The consent of the Senate, expressed before or after, or before and after, the vote of the people. 4 The occurrence of favourable auspices.(177) These forms are represented to have been used by the first five kings. Servius acquired the throne by fraud; and he was the first to assume the regal power without election,(178) though he attempted to cure this defect in his appointment by a subsequent vote of the people. Tarquinius Superbus set aside all constitutional forms, and obtained the supreme power by force. The existence of the interrex under the commonwealth—a peculiar institution which must be considered as a relic of the regal period—proves that the ancient royalty must have been elective; for if the succession had been hereditary, no interregnum would have occurred, and no such officer would have been requisite. Nevertheless, we find throughout the history of the kings, traces of the admission of a hereditary right to the throne. Romulus is chosen king because he is of the royal family of Alba, the metropolis of Rome;(179) Numa married Tatia, the daughter of Titus Tatius, the colleague of Romulus in the royalty;(180) Marcius, who married Pompilia, the daughter of Numa, is said to have contested the kingdom with Tullus Hostilius, and, being defeated in the election, to have starved himself to death.(181) Ancus Marcius is the grandson of Numa, and he is reported to have murdered Tullus Hostilius and his sons, in order to prevent the latter from succeeding to the throne.(182) Tarquinius Priscus is guardian to the young children of Ancus, and he obtains his election by sending them out of the way, until he has been able to canvass the people for their votes.(183) Ultimately, these pretenders succeed in putting him to death; though they fail in securing the throne.(184) Servius is the son-in-law of Tarquinius Priscus, and obtains the crown by the assistance of Tanaquil, his queen; and he is deposed and murdered by the son of the previous king, who is moreover his own son-in-law. That the ancient writers should have introduced these allusions to a hereditary succession is natural; for the Roman kingdom appears to be the only instance in antiquity of a series of elective kings.(185)

---

(176) Quo quidem tempore novus ille populus vidit tamen id, quod fugit Lacedæmonium Lycurgum, qui regem non deligendum duxit (si modo hoc in Lycurgi potestate potuit esse), sed habendum, qualiscunque is foret, qui modo esset Herculis stirpe generatus. Nostri illi, etiam tum agrestes, viderunt virtutem et sapientiam regalem, non progeniem, quæri oportere; De Rep. ii. 12.

(177) See Dion. Hal. iv. 80, who makes a decree of the Senate the first step. Livy, i. 17, gives the formula used by the interrex, in addressing the popular assembly, in the following words: 'Quod bonum, faustum, felixque sit, Quirites, regem create; ita Patribus visum est. Patres deinde, si dignum qui secundus ab Romulo numeretur crearitis, auctores fient.' According to this formula, the Senate first authorize the election, and afterwards exercise a veto upon the person elected. In describing the election of Tullus Hostilius, Livy says: 'Regem populus jussit; Patres auctores facti;' i. 22. Afterwards: 'Ancum Marcium regem populus creavit: Patres fuere auctores;' i. 32. For the election of Tarquinius, he merely says: Ingenti consensu populus Romanus regnare jussit, i. 35, without mentioning the confirmation of the Senate. Cicero describes three stages: 1 The election by the people in comitia curiata: 2 The confirmation by the Senate; 3 The lex curiata de imperio, passed after the election: Rep. ii. 13, 17, 18, 20. The latter seems to be considered by him a merely formal proceeding.

(178) Primus injussu populi, voluntate Patrum regnavit; Livy, i. 41. Primus injussu populi regnavisse traditur; Cic. Rep. ii. 21. See above, n. 43.

---

(179) In Dion. Hal. ii. 4, the people are described as choosing Romulus *τοῦ τε βασιλείου γένους ἕνεκα καὶ ἀρετῆς*. See above, p. 411.

(180) Plut. Num. 3. Above, p. 453.

(181) Plut. Num. 21. See above, p. 453, n. 141.

(182) Above, p. 461.

(183) Jam filii prope puberem ætatem erant: eo magis Tarquinius instare, ut quam primum comitia regi creando fierent. Quibus indictis, sub tempus pueros venatum ablegavit; Livy, i. 35.

(184) Livy, i. 40, describes the sons of Ancus as deciding to kill the king himself, because if they killed Servius, his widow would marry again, and Tarquin would be able to leave the crown to his new son-in-law. See above, p. 484, n. 41. In iv. 3, Canuleius speaks of it as remarkable that L. Tarquin, a stranger from Tarquinii, vivis liberis Anci regem factum. In Diod. x. 1, Tarquinius Superbus reproaches Servius with having deprived him of the throne, which was due to him by legitimate succession. A similar taunt occurs in Dionysius, above, p. 506. Respecting Servius and the sons of Tarquinius Priscus, see p. 503, n. 90.

Again: although so much regard is shown to hereditary descent in the succession to the throne, yet the choice of the people falls more than once upon a foreigner—a circumstance for which no adequate explanation can be given. Thus Numa is fetched from the Sabine town of Cures, while the two Tarquins and Servius are of Etruscan birth.(186)

It is expressly stated that the constitutional powers of the Roman king were very limited, and that no measure of legislation, no decision of war or peace, and not even any important administrative or judicial act, could take place without the consent of the Senate and people.(187) The constitution of Servius, with its elaborate system of voting, implies a complete development of the popular power; and the system which it superseded is described as having been still more democratic. Yet the history is exclusively concerned with the king's exploits: not even in the annals of an oriental state could he occupy a more exclusive attention: there is no independent action in the Senate or the people; the Romans are mere undistinguished units, mere passive and unnamed instruments in the king's hands.(188) If the first six kings had been as absolute and uncontrolled despots as the last Tarquin, they could not, to all appearance, have enjoyed a more ample authority. They make laws, they wage wars, they govern the state, without the smallest sign of opposition, or of a conflicting will, or of a dissentient voice, from a single citizen. If the constitution had been as it is described to us, such a state of things could not have occurred. Powers, such as those which are attributed to the Senate and people under the kings, never slumber; if we had an authentic history of the period, and the form of government had been such as is represented, some traces of the active exercise, as well as of the legal existence, of these powers would infallibly be visible.

---

(185) Mai, on Cic. Rep. ii. 17, says: 'Profecto, etsi Romani reges suffragiis legebantur, nihilominus plerumque rationem cognationis in iis creandis habitam esse videmus.'

(186) See Livy, i. 34; iv. 3.

(187) Writers differ as to the time when the restrictions on the royal prerogative were introduced. Livy and Dionysius conceive them to have existed from the beginning. Tacitus, on the other hand, says that Romulus was an arbitrary king, and that the first limits on the regal omnipotence were imposed by Servius, Ann. iii. 24. Pomponius, in the passage in the Digest, i. 2, takes a similar view: Initio civitatis nostræ populus sine lege certâ, sine jure certo primum agere instituit, omniaque manu a regibus gubernabantur; § 1. Quod ad magistratus attinet, initio civitatis hujus constat reges omnem potestatem habuisse; § 14.

(188) 'Not a single Roman (says Niebuhr) is mentioned by name in the legends of Tullus and the three following kings;' Hist. vol. i. p. 234. Even Cicero makes a similar remark, who had access to the earliest accounts of the regal period, now no longer extant. In the Dialogue of the Republic, Lælius is described as expressing his surprise at the obscurity of the early Roman history—for that the name of the father of Ancus

The shutting of the palace by Tanaquil after the murder of Tarquinius Priscus is an event sufficiently probable, if we suppose the government to be despotic.(189) But it is an incident unsuited to an elective kingdom; nor is there any sufficient explanation of the means by which Tarquinius Superbus converts a limited royalty into a despotism. For such a change, something more is necessary than the mere will of the ruler.

The legal powers of the crown were limited,(190) and all the kings up to Tarquinius Superbus kept within the prescribed bounds; the character and operation of the government during the royal period was therefore popular; and the people are not described as submitting unwillingly to the established rule, or as desiring a change. Servius, in particular, is represented as a popular king, who offered to resign the insignia of his office into the hands of the community; and who meditated the abolition of the

---

Marcius is not recorded: Scipio then answers; 'Ita est; sed temporum illorum tantum fere regum illustrata sunt nomina;' ii. 18. This passage is referred to by Sen. Epist. 108, § 30. See above, p. 465, n. 181.

(189) Thus the death of Philip V. of Macedon was concealed by Calligenes the physician, until Perseus was ready to seize the power; Livy, xl. 56-7. The death of Ptolemy Philopator was in like manner concealed for a considerable time by his profligate favourites; Justin, xxx. 2. Livia concealed the death of Augustus, in order to give Tiberius time to arrive: Tac. Ann. i. 5; Dio Cass. lvi. 31. Similar incidents have occurred in Oriental palaces.

(190) Sallust, Cat. 6, says of the Roman kings: 'Imperium legitimum, nomen imperii regium habebant.'

kingly office, and the substitution of annual magistrates; whence he became the idol of plebeians in later times. In the debate about the negotiation with the plebeians on the First Secession, in Dionysius, the consuls say that from the foundation of the city, the Senate had the chief power in everything, except the election of magistrates, the making of laws, and questions of peace and war; in all of which the people by its votes was supreme.(191) This statement implies that the power of the Senate and people had been the same, in those respects, before and after the expulsion of the kings. At a somewhat later date, Minucius, one of the consuls, is represented as saying that the Senate, even under the kings, had always had the initiative with respect to bringing measures before the popular assembly.(192) Coriolanus is introduced as declaring that the original government of Rome was mixed of royalty and aristocracy, which remained until Tarquin converted it into a despotism.(193) C. Claudius is represented as saying, soon after the fall of the Decemvirs, that the kings had never encroached upon the rights of the Senate.(194) We are moreover expressly told that the power of the dictator was greater than that of the kings.(195) Brutus, in deliberating with Lucretius and Collatinus on the measures to be adopted, says that when they have expelled Tarquin, they will consider what is the best form of government; if indeed any form is better than that which Romulus and Numa and the other kings have handed down to them, and under which Rome had been great and prosperous, and acquired extensive power.(196) Livy expressly remarks that the deed of Brutus would have been premature, if it had been committed in one of the former reigns; and that the state would have derived no benefit from the abolition of royalty if it had taken place in the time of any of the other kings.(197) The reign of Tarquinius

---

(191) Dion. Hal. vi. 66. (192) Ib. vii. 38. (193) Ib. viii. 5.

(194) Ne reges quidem majestatem summi ordinis imminuisse; Livy, iii. 63.

(195) Dion. Hal. v. 71. (196) Ib. iv. 73.

(197) Neque ambigitur quin Brutus idem, qui tantum gloriæ, Superbo exacto rege, meruit, pessimo publico id facturus fuerit, si libertatis immaturæ cupidine priorum alicui regnum extorsisset; ii. 1.

Superbus is said to have lasted only twenty-five years, out of the 244 years assigned as the duration of the regal period; and yet the change from the royal to the consular government is described to have been as important in its consequences as if the Romans had never before enjoyed liberty, and as if they had relieved themselves from a long continued line of hereditary despots.(198) The expulsion of Tarquin, and the abolition of his usurped power, would naturally confer a great benefit on the generation who smarted under his rule; but the alteration of the form of government, as it is described to us, has no greater extent than this: that the popular rights suppressed by him were restored, and that the powers of the king elected for life were divided between two consuls annually elected.(199) Hence it has been not unreasonably conjectured that the previous kings had, like Tarquin, exercised their power in a tyrannical manner.(200) Such a suspicion however is quite inconsistent with the account which comes to us as the history of the first six reigns.

In many of the Greek states, when the political powers of the ancient heroic king were gradually stripped from him, the royal office remained, but with no other functions than those of making certain sacrifices, or performing certain religious rites, on behalf of the state.(201) Thus the King-archon of Athens was a relic of this nature; and the descendants of Androclus, the founder of Ephesus, bore in after times the title of kings, were honoured with certain royal insignia, and administered the rites of Ceres of Eleusis.(202) A similar officer, entitled the King of the Sacrifices (Rex Sacrificulus), existed at Rome; his functions were purely religious, and he was entirely devoid of political power or importance. His office is stated to have been instituted for the purpose of preventing the existence of any regret for the kings.(203) Such a feeling is conceivable, if the regal power is gradually extinguished by easy steps, and voluntary concessions. But where a royal family is expelled by a forcible revolution, and the form of government is changed, under the influence of active resentment, and a sense of recent oppression, it is difficult to account for the creation of such an office.(204) The Athenians would not have wished to establish any such memorial of the rule of the Pisistratidæ, or the Syracusans of that of the Dionysii. It has indeed been conjectured by Niebuhr, on other grounds, that the change from the royal to the consular form of government was made gradually, and by a mutual compromise.(205) But no such hypothesis can be reconciled with the accounts which we have received as the history of the period. The forcible expulsion of the Tarquins is inseparably connected with the institution of the consular government: and although a different course of events may appear to us more probable, we are not at liberty, without some positive evidence, to assume it to have really happened. Müller indeed supposes that the reigns of the two Tarquins represent, in symbolical language, the political ascendancy of the Etruscan city of Tarquinii over Rome; and that this ascendancy is for a time interrupted by the invasion of Servius, or Mastarna, an Etruscan general from Volsinii, who is unfriendly to the influence of Tarquinii, and introduces different principles of government. In the expulsion of the Tarquins from Rome he sees only the overthrow of the predominance of Tarquinii, which was probably effected by the arms of Lars Porsena of Clusium.(206) But conjectures which depart thus widely from the traditionary accounts are not admissible: if the narrative handed down to us is not worthy of belief, it must be rejected; but if an attempt is made to reconstruct a history upon hypotheses, all fixed standard of credibility is wanting, and we shall have as many different versions of the events as there are successive historians.

---

(198) Nam quum a primo urbis ortu, regiis institutis partim etiam legibus, auspicia, cærimoniæ, comitia, provocationes, patrum consilium, equitum peditumque descriptio, tota res militaris, divinitus esset constituta; tum progressio admirabilis incredibilisque cursus ad omnem excellentiam factus est, dominatu regio republicâ liberatâ; Cic. Tusc. Disp. iv. 1. Sed civitas incredibile memoratu est, adeptâ libertate, quantum brevi creverat: tanta cupido gloriæ incesserat; Sallust, Cat. 7. These passages may be compared with the remarks of Herodotus, upon the sudden spring in national power and energy which the Athenians made when they were relieved from the despotic rule of the Pisistratidæ, and began to be governed by equal laws; v. 78. An attempt to explain the views of the Romans respecting the acquisition of liberty by the expulsion of the kings, is made by Becker, ii. 1, p. 356.

(199) Libertatis autem originem inde magis quia annuum imperium consulare factum est, quam quod deminutum quidquam sit ex regiâ potestate, numeres; Livy, ii. 1. Quippe ex perpetuo annuum placuit, ex singulari duplex, ne potestas solitudine vel morâ corrumperetur; Florus, i. 9.

(200) Sed Romani quanta mala per ducentos quadraginta et tres annos continuâ illâ regum dominatione pertulerint, non solum unius regis expulsio, verum etiam ejuratio regii nominis et potestatis ostendit. Nam si unius tantum superbia fuisset in culpâ, ipsum solum oportuisset expelli, servatâ regiâ dignitate melioribus; Orosius, Hist. ii. 4. See above, p. 430, n. 80.

---

(201) See above, p. 105. (202) Strabo, xiv. 1, § 3.

(203) Quia quædam sacra publica per ipsos reges factitata erant, ne ubiubi regum desiderium esset, regem sacrificulum creant; Livy, ii. 2. *ἐπειδὴ δὲ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιοι γενόμενοι τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμασιν ἔδοξαν οἱ βασιλεῖς, φυλάττειν τοὔνομα τῆς ἀρχῆς, ὅσον ἂν ἡ πόλις διαμένῃ χρόνον, βουλόμενοι, τοὺς ἱεροφάντας τε καὶ οἰωνομάντεις ἐκέλευσαν*, &c.; Dion. Hal. v. 1; cf. iv. 74. See also Plut. Quæst. Rom. 63, who compares the Greek and Roman practices.

(204) M. Horatius Barbatus, in his speech at the time of the decemvirs, in Livy, iii. 39, explains the institution of the King of the Sacrifices, by saying that the people, though indignant against Tarquin, were not weary of the name of king: 'Nec nominis homines tum pertæsum esse; quippe quo Jovem appellari fas sit, quo Romulum conditorem urbis, deincepsque reges appellatos, quod sacris etiam, ut solemne, retentum sit.'

(205) Hist. vol. i. p. 518, 538.

The detailed history of the Roman kings represents them as elective, with limited and not with arbitrary powers, and as the heads of a constitution in which the Senate and people each bear an important part. Nevertheless we meet at other times with statements founded on a different view of the Roman royalty. Thus Appius alludes to the plebeians having been relieved from the taxes which they formerly paid to the kings, and from the bodily punishments which were inflicted upon them, if they did not speedily obey the orders given them.(207) We are likewise told, in reference to the decemviral legislation, that the kings used to exercise an arbitrary jurisdiction without written laws:(208) and, again, that their power was irresponsible.(209) The accounts moreover of the influence by which Tarquin was put down do not quite harmonize: thus at one time we are told that he was expelled by the heads of the aristocracy,(210) at another, that the people assisted the patricians in effecting his expulsion.(211)

---

(206) Etrusker, vol. i. p. 117—123, 203, 380-8. Strabo, instead of conceiving Rome as subject to Etruria under the Tarquins, speaks of Tarquinius Superbus as having embellished Etruria out of Roman resources. ἐκόσμησε δ᾽ οὖν τὴν Τυρρηνίαν καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ πρότερον, ὁ μὲν εὐπορίᾳ δημιουργῶν τῶν συνακολουθησάντων οἴκοθεν, ὁ δὲ ταῖς ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης ἀφορμαῖς; v. 2, § 2. Tarquinius Priscus is described by Dionysius as defeating the Etruscans, and receiving their homage; iii. 57—62. Livy says that Tarquinius Superbus renewed the treaty with the Etruscans; i. 55. Müller's hypothesis respecting the Tarquinian rule at Rome is rejected by Schwegler, vol. i. p. 679.

(207) Dion. Hal. vi. 21.

If we abstain from arbitrary hypothesis, and adhere to the history which we have received from antiquity, it is impossible that a clear and consistent idea of the government of Rome during the regal period should be formed. All the events have a legendary character, and there is no firm footing for the historical inquirer. The narrative does not bear the marks of having been founded on the records of observations made by eye and ear-witnesses, who were present at the successive events. Such a narrative, though derived from the reports of various and unconnected persons, must, if it be properly constructed, be intelligible and coherent; because the events which it records have a real internal unity, and are connected by a continuous thread of causation. The narrative which is presented to us seems rather to have been formed out of insulated legends—and other records of traditionary stories—containing an uncertain and indeterminable amount of real fact, and intended, in many instances, to explain the names of persons, places, and public monuments, and the existence of laws and usages, civil and religious.

The constitutional accounts of the regal period are peculiarly confused and contradictory; not only are the descriptions of the constitution inconsistent with the accounts of the acts of the successive kings, but the general characteristics attributed to the government are inconsistent with each other. It has been supposed that the oral traditions of the Roman constitution were more faithful and trustworthy than the oral traditions of particular events and exploits.(212) It seems, however, on the contrary, that the traditions of the constitution were indistinct and inaccurate; whereas, individual acts of generosity, courage, and patriotism, or of cruelty and oppression, were more likely to live in the popular memory.(213)

---

(208) Dion. Hal. x. 1.

(209) Ib. xi. 41, the regal office is described as an ἀνυπεύθυνος ἀρχή. Tacitus, Ann. iii. 26. considers the powers of the Roman kings to have been unlimited until the reign of Servius. Qui [consules] tamen ne per omnia regiam potestatem sibi vindicarent, lege latâ factum est ut ab eis provocatio esset; Pomponius. § 16. This implies that there was no appeal from the kings. See above, n. 187.

(210) Dion. Hal. viii. 5, in the speech of Coriolanus.

(211) Dion. Hal. v. 65; vii. 41; x. 38.

The predominant belief of the Romans concerning their regal government was, that the power of the kings was limited by constitutional checks; that the chief institutions of the Republic, namely, the Senate and the Popular Assembly, existed in combination with the royalty, and were only suspended by the lawless despotism of the second Tarquin. Occasionally however we meet with the idea that the kings were absolute; the later notion of a king—that which existed in the minds of the conspirators who murdered Cæsar—was sometimes transferred to the old royalty. The Roman kingdom therefore was alternately conceived as democratic and despotic.

The former is the view taken by Dionysius. He represents Romulus as dividing the entire free community, consisting of patricians and plebeians, into thirty curiæ, and he states that each citizen had an equal vote within his curia. He further describes the people, in comitia curiata, as empowered to elect magistrates, make laws, and decide concerning peace and war, upon the proposal of the king, and with the consent of the Senate.(214) Servius, according to Dionysius, tempered the democratic purity of this constitution by his system of centuries, in which the votes were so arranged that the wealthy few preponderated over the poor many, and he thus infused into the government an aristocratic element which did not before exist.(215)

---

(212) See Rubino and Niebuhr cited above, p. 113—5. Schwegler, vol. i. p. 41, 67.

(213) Dr. Arnold says of the latter part of the regal period, that, 'although some real elements exist, yet the general picture before us is a mere fantasy;' Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 49. In p. 48 he remarks: 'The stories of the two Tarquinii and of Servius Tullius are so much more disappointing than those of the earlier kings, inasmuch as they seem at first to wear a more historical character, and as they really contain much that is undoubtedly true, but yet, when examined, they are found not to be history, nor can any one attach what is real in them to any of the real persons by whom it was effected;' p. 48.

(214) Dion. Hal. ii. 14; iv. 20.

A view of the primitive Roman constitution has however been propounded by Niebuhr, and adopted by most of his successors, which makes it neither democratic nor despotic, and thus enters upon an entirely new and hypothetical ground. This view is, that the curiæ consisted exclusively of patricians; that they constituted the original *populus* or sovereign community, and that the plebeian body stood without both the curiæ and the populus.(216) According to this hypothesis, therefore, the original Roman constitution was a close oligarchy, presided over by a king.

The curiæ and comitia curiata were among the institutions which in the later ages of the Republic had become antiquated; which had lost their original substance and practical efficacy, and had become forms, with merely a religious signification. Hence there was nothing in their existing state which explained their original character. The only express testimony which we have in relation to their primitive constitution, that of Dionysius, represents them as democratic, not as aristocratic bodies; the same historian describes the tribunes of the plebs as having been originally elected in comitia curiata, a statement which is confirmed by Cicero.(217)

The arguments by which it is attempted to prove that the curiæ were aristocratic bodies, and consisted exclusively of patricians, are all indirect and conjectural;(218) no trace of any such idea is to be found in any ancient writer, or even in any modern writer prior to Niebuhr.(219) It is indeed highly improbable that the constitution of Rome, in the eighth century before Christ, was democratic; but if we reject the positive testimonies respecting those early times, we must be contented to remain in ignorance concerning them, and not attempt to supply the void by arbitrary conjectures and hypothetical constructions of our own.

---

(215) Ib. iv. 20. Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 621; Niebuhr, Hist. vol, ii. p. 222. Above, p. 497.

(216) See Niebuhr, vol. i. p. 324—7; Becker, ii. 1, p. 136, 372; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 622—8; Arnold, Hist. vol. i. p. 28. This view is likewise adopted by Mr. Newman, in his Essay on the Comitia Curiata in the Classical Museum, vol. vi. p. 99. This Essay contains an excellent appreciation of Niebuhr's method of dealing with historical evidence.

(217) See Dion. Hal. vi. 89. ix. 41; Cic. pro Corn. ii.; below, ch. xii. § 32. Compare Becker, ii. 2, p. 254, who rejects this statement as erroneous.

(218) See Schwegler, ib. p. 622—8, where they are summed up with great clearness. The non-existence of the right of marriage between

§ 41 Independently of the political and military history of the kings, there is also connected with the regal period a topographical history of the city of Rome. The process by which the famous seven hills were successively aggregated into one city is described as having been accomplished during the first five reigns. The foundation of Romulus is related to have been on the Palatine hill;(220) and the boundaries of the pomœrium of

---

patricians and plebeians, which Schwegler uses as a proof that both were not in the original curiæ, has no bearing on this question; as the prohibition is stated to have been introduced by the twelve tables: see below, ch. xii. § 56. The identity of the *auctoritas patrum* with the *lex curiata de imperio*, which is the main support of this hypothesis, is itself a hypothesis, and is not proved by the argument of Becker, ii. 1, p. 314—26. The celebrated passage of Cicero, De Leg. Agr. ii. 11, shows that the lex curiata de imperio was originally the subject of a popular vote, and that it was different from the confirmation either of the Senate or the patricians. See Marquardt, Handbuch, iii. 3, p. 186. The lex curiata de imperio was proposed to the comitia curiata, according to the regular practice, in 308 B.C.; Livy, ix. 38. Camillus is described by Livy as having been recalled from exile by the comitia curiata, and appointed dictator jussu populi; v. 46. The latter was irregular. Camillus afterwards describes the comitia curiata as relating to military affairs: 'Comitia curiata, quæ rem militarem continent;' v. 52. Appius Claudius, in his speech at the time of the Licinian rogations, speaks of the Senate as confirming the act of the comitia curiata: 'nec centuriatis nec curiatis comitiis patres auctores fiant,' iv. 41. The latter passage is a clear proof that Livy conceived the 'auctoritas patrum' to be distinct from an act of the comitia curiata.

(219) It is possible that the word *populus* may have originally signified the patricians without the plebeians: it certainly seems to require this sense in the oracle in Livy, xxv. 12: Prætor is qui jus *populo plebique* dabit summum. See Newman, ib. p. 114. But it is equally certain that *populus* in Livy and the other Roman historians, and δῆμος in Dionysius, is used by them in the received acceptation of those words; and we are not entitled to assume that they did not understand their own language, or that of the historians whose writings they used. See Becker, ii. 1, p. 136, 300; Schwegler, vol. i. p. 620. The meaning affixed by Niebuhr to *populus* is rejected by Rubino, ib. p. 260.

(220) Compare Schwegler, vol. i. p. 725—30. The Palatine was the

Romulus round its base, were shown in the time of Tacitus.(221) The Palatine, the Aventine, and the Capitoline hills are also described as having been fortified in the same reign; and when the joint kingdom of Romulus and Tatius was formed, the subjects of the former are said to have occupied the Palatine and the Cælian, those of Tatius the Capitoline and Quirinal hills.(222) It is nevertheless stated that Numa first added the Quirinal hill to the city, and fortified it.(223) The accounts respecting the incorporation of the Cælian hill are likewise divergent; for the arrival of Cæles, who is supposed to have given his name to the hill, is placed under different reigns.(224) Livy and Eutropius state that the Cælian was added by Tullus,(225) while Cicero and Strabo affirm that both the Cælian and Aventine were added by Ancus;(226) as to the latter hill, agreeing with Dionysius.(227) The Viminal and Esquiline hills are reported to have been annexed by Servius, which completes the number of seven: some writers however include the Quirinal among the additions of

---

station of Romulus when he took the augury of the city, the Aventine of Remus. Livy, i. 6; Dion. Hal. i. 86. As to the Palatine being the original settlement, see the passages in Becker, vol. i. p. 93; Schwegler, p. 442. Compare Ovid:

> Hic locus est Vestæ, qui Pallada servat et ignem,
> Hic fuit antiqui regia parva Numæ.
> Inde petens dextram, Porta est, ait, ista Palatî;
> Hic Stator, hoc primum condita Roma loco est.
> Trist. iii. 1, 29—32.

Romulus Martis filius, ultus injurias avi, Romam urbem Parilibus in Palatio condidit; Vell. i. 8. See above, p. 386, 390.

(221) Ann. xii. 24. Compare Gell. xiii. 14.

(222) Dion. Hal. ii. 36—50. According to Strabo v. 3, § 7, the Capitoline, Palatine, and Quirinal were the three hills fortified in the reign of Romulus. Varro stated that the Aventine was assigned by Romulus to the Sabines; Serv. Æn. vii. 657.

(223) Ib. 62.

(224) Livy, i. 30. Dionysius, iii. 1, apparently forgetting his former account, also says that Tullus included the Cælian. Compare Schwegler, p. 574, n. 2. Above, p. 508.

(225) Livy, i. 30; Eutrop. i. 4. Victor de Vir. Ill. 4, makes the same statement.

(226) Cic. de Rep. ii. 18; Strab. ubi sup.

(227) Dion. Hal. iii. 43. Eutropius, i. 5, and Victor. ib. 5, say that the Aventine and Janiculum were the hills added by Ancus.

Servius.(228) The fortification of Janiculum on the northern bank of the river is ascribed to Ancus,(229) who is also said to have founded Ostia.(230) The ancient wall of the city, which was extant in the historical ages of Rome, was attributed to Servius, who is said to have first included the seven hills within a single rampart.(231) The building of the city wall is however also attributed to Tarquinius Priscus.(232) Another portion of fortification, of which Servius has the credit, is ascribed by Pliny to Tarquinius Superbus.(233) That the Palatine hill was the original centre of the city, may be considered as established by the locality of the pomœrium, the boundaries of which sacred precinct were likely to be preserved by a faithful and continuous tradition;(234) but with regard to the successive annexation of the other hills, the accounts are so confused and inconsistent, that no reliance can be placed upon them. Some writers indeed conceived all the seven hills as included in the original city of Romulus.(235)

---

(228) Dion. Hal. iv. 13; Strabo, ubi sup. According to Livy, i. 44, Servius added the Quirinal and Viminal, and improved the Esquiliæ. Victor, de Vir. Ill. 7, mentions all three.

(229) Dion. Hal. iii. 45; Livy, i. 33; Victor, c. 5.

(230) Dion. Hal. iii. 44; Livy, i. 33; Cic. Rep. ii. 18; Victor, c. 5; Eutrop. i. 5; Florus, i. 4,

(231) ὁ δὲ Τύλλιος, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἑπτὰ λόφους ἑνὶ τείχει περιέλαβεν, &c. Dion. Hal. iv. 14. Aggere et fossis et muro circumdat urbem; Livy, i. 44. Victor, de Vir. Ill. c. 7, says: Aggerem fossasque fecit, leaving out the wall. Eutropius, i. 7, has only: Fossas circa murum duxit.

Concerning the walls of Servius Tullius, see Becker, vol. i. p. 126; Bunbury, in the Classical Journal, vol. iii. p. 345.

(232) Dion. Hal. ii. 67; Livy, i. 36—38. Murum lapideum urbi circumdedit; Victor, c. 6. Muros fecit et cloacas; Eutrop. i. 6. According to Florus, the city wall was built by Ancus: igitur et muro mœnia amplexus est; i. 4.

(233) The strong fortification between the Esquiline and Colline gates is attributed by Strabo, v. 3, § 7, to Servius (see Dion. Hal. ix. 68): but Pliny, N. H. iii. 9, says of the city: clauditur ab oriente aggere Tarquinii Superbi, inter prima opere mirabili. Namque eum muris æquavit, qua maxime patebat aditu plano. Compare Becker, vol. i. p. 171.

(234) Tacitus, ubi sup., evidently considers the pomœrium, the limits of which he describes, to have been the original pomœrium of Romulus. Livy, i. 44, however, speaks of the pomœrium being advanced by Servius. Compare Becker, ib. p. 92; Bunbury, ib. p. 341; Schwegler, i. 1, p. 449. Under the Empire, the Aventine was the only one of the seven hills excluded from the pomœrium. Various reasons were assigned for this circumstance: the reason which Messala preferred was, that it was the hill on which Remus took his unfavourable auspices against Romulus. Gell. N. A. xiii. 14. Above, p. 390.

---

(235) Servius, on Æn. vi. 784, says: Nam grandis est inde dubitatio; et alii dicunt, breves septem colliculos a Romulo inclusos, qui tamen aliis nominibus appellabantur. Alii volunt hos ipsos, qui nunc sunt, a Romulo inclusos, id est, Palatinum, Quirinalem, Aventinum, Cœlium, Viminalem, Æsquilinum, et Janicularem. Alii vero volunt, hos quidem fuisse aliis nominibus appellatos, quæ mutata sunt postea.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Page 6, note 13. Since this sheet was printed, I have, through the kindness of a friend, obtained an account of the second edition of the Dissertation of Beaufort, from a copy of it which is preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. The title-page is, 'Dissertation, &c. Par Louis de Beaufort, Membre de la Société Royale d'Angleterre. Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée, et considérablement augmentée; à la Haye. 1758." 1 vol. 12mo. The second edition contains 488 pages, whereas the first edition contains only 348 pages. About fifty pages at the end consist of an answer to the strictures of Christopher Saxe, on the first edition of the work, in the Miscellanea Lipsiensia.

P. 46, n. 118. Niebuhr thinks that the passage of Livy, ix. 36, was written after the campaigns of Drusus (about 10 B.C.). Compare Florus, iv. 12, § 27. Invisum atque inaccessum in id tempus, Hercynium saltum patefecit. Livy was born in 59 B.C., and was therefore nearly fifty years old at this time. (Hist. vol. iii. p. 279, n. 285.)

P. 55. Concerning the subjects of the several books of the Annales of Ennius, see the 'Quæstiones Ennianæ,' prefixed to Vahlen's recent edition of the remains of Ennius (Ennianæ poesis reliquiæ, Lips. 1854).

P. 62, n. 170. Theophrastus wrote some ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα, of which a few fragments remain. From these fragments it seems as if their chief contents were notices of singular customs: see vol. v. p. 193, 291, ed. Schneider. It is possible that his notice of Rome occurred in this work. Aristoxenus, a disciple of Aristotle, and contemporary of Theophrastus, mentioned Romans, as well as Lucanians, Messapians, and Peucetians, having come to Pythagoras in order to hear his teaching; fr. 5, Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 273.

P. 63, n. 172. See Mure, Hist. of Gr. Lit. vol. iv. p. 152-3.

P. 65, n. 187. Compare Aristoxenus, ap. Athen. xiv. p. 632 A.

P. 72, n. 5. The execution of the Campanian legion in 271 B.C., is described in one of the extant fragments of Dionysius; xx. 8. Compare Liv. Epit. xv.; Polyb. i. 7.

P. 78, n. 14. Two short papers on the Latin historians before Livy are in Class. Journ. vol. xxiii. p. 139, 378.

P. 83, n. 29. Compare the character of the companion of Servilius, in Ennius, Ann. vii. 10, ed. Vahlen.

> Multa tenens antiqua sepulta, vetustas
> Quem fecit mores veteresque novosque tenentem,
> Multorum veterum leges divumque hominumque.

P. 86, n. 36. Compare Cic. Acad. Prior. ii. 2. Ego autem quum Græcas litteras M. Catonem in senectute didicisse acceperim. Quintil. xii. 11, § 23; M. Censorius Cato—litteras Græcas ætate jam declinatâ didicit. The meaning of these passages is explained by Val. Max. viii. 7. § 1; Idem Græcis litteris erudiri concupivit, quam sero, inde æstimemus, quod etiam Latinas pæne senex didicit. Plut. Cat. Maj. 12, represents Cato as able to make a Greek speech in 184 B.C., when he was about forty years old. See Bayle, Dict. art. Porcius, note I., on Cato learning Greek. His contempt and dislike for Greek literature are described in Plut. Cat. Maj. 12, 22-3; Plin. N. H. xxix. 7.

P. 103, n. 11. Dio Cassius speaks of the institution of interreges as being still in use in the time of Cæsar; xl. 45; xlvi. 45.

P. 113, l. 3, *for* occupations *read* occupation.

P. 146, n. 52, *for* et fœdere, *read* ex fœdere.

P. 154, n. 76. It seems from the expressions of Thucydides, in vii. 8, that at the time of the Peloponnesian war, the ordinary course was for the commanders to send verbal, not written, accounts of military affairs to the Athenian government.

P. 155. Diomedes de Metris, iii. 8, p. 442, ed. Gaisford, compares the Annales of Ennius with the 'publici annales, quos pontifices scribæque conficiunt.'

P. 156. The author of the Certamen Hom. et Hes. ad fin., states that the Delians caused the Homeric hymn to Apollo to be written on plaster, and dedicated in the temple of Diana. This, in the Roman phraseology, would be called 'in album referre.' Δήλιοι δὲ γράψαντες τὰ ἔπη εἰς λεύκωμα ἀνέθηκαν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῷ, p. 253, in Goettling's Hesiod.

P. 161. Varro determined chronology by calculating eclipses backwards; see Censorin. de D. N. c. 21; Sed hoc quodcunque caliginis Varro discussit, et pro ceterâ suâ sagacitate nunc diversarum civitatium conferens tempora, nunc defectus eorumque intervalla retro dinumerans, eruit verum, lucemque ostendit, per quam numerus certus non annorum modo sed et dierum perspici possit.

P. 162, n. 110, *read* Pliny, H. N. xxviii. 4.

P. 168, n. 120. The story that Acusilaus wrote his work, entitled 'Genealogies,' from brazen plates, which his father dug up in his house, is probably founded on some forgery like that of the ordinances of Numa, or some fable like that in the preface to Dictys of Crete; Suidas, in Ἀκουσίλαος.

An ancient inscription on a brazen plate, predicting the destruction of the Persian empire by the Greeks, was said to have been miraculously projected from a fountain near Xanthus in Asia Minor, in the time of Alexander; Plut. Alex. 17.

P. 173, n. 139. Linen books are mentioned as having been used in the time of Aurelian; Vopisc. Aurel. c. 1, and 8.

P. 182, n. 15, *for* nations, *read* matrons.

P. 189, l. 19, *for* the Punic War, *read* the Second Punic War.

P. 192, n. 41, *for* 451 B.C., *read* 451 U.C.

P. 199, n. 58, *for* Plut. Rom. 3, *read* Plut. Num. 3.

P. 200, n. 60. Flaccus and Cæcina, in Schol. Veron. ad Æn. ix. 198, who are called Etruscan historians by Niebuhr, Lect. on Rom. Hist. vol. i. p. 100, appear from the extracts cited by the scholiast to have written in Latin. On the Etruscan literature, see K. O. Müller, Kleine Schriften, vol. i. p. 213.

P. 237. The earliest library in Rome was established by Æmilius Paulus in 168 B.C. Plut. Æmil. 28; Gräfenhan, Gesch. der Philol. vol. ii. p. 243.

P. 259, n. 38. See the account of Cato's Latin speech at Athens, Plut. Cat. Maj. 12.

P. 262, l. 15, *for* larger, *read* large.

P. 264, n. 47. Machiavel, Disc. ii. 5. Chi legge i modi tenuti da San Gregorio e da li altri capi della religione Cristiana, vedrà con quanta ostinazione e' perseguitarono tutte le memorie antiche, ardendo l'opere de' poeti e degli istorici, ruinando le immagini, e guastando ogni altra cosa che rendesse alcun segno dell' antichità.

P. 270, n. 6. Compare Niebuhr, Lect. on Anc. Hist. vol. i. p. 204. '*Danai* and *Daunii* are unquestionably the same, and the Daunii are clearly allied to the Tyrrhenian race. Danaë is said to have founded the Pelasgico-Tyrrhenian Ardea; and on the other hand, the father of Tyrrhenus (=Turnus) was, according to some called Daunus, and his mother Danaë. *Daunus* and *Launus* again are the same. . . . . . *Launa*, *Lavinia*, and *Lavinium*, are the same as the different names of the Latins, *Lavici*, *Lakinii*, *Latini*, and all these names are identical with *Danai*.'

P. 274, n. 21. Heyne conjectures Alcinoe for Alcyone; Hellan. fr. 53, ed. Didot. Compare ib. fr. 51.

P. 282, n. 49. Herodotus states that the Phocæans were the first Greeks who discovered the Adriatic sea, and Tyrrhenia; i. 163. He was therefore ignorant of a primitive Pelasgian migration from Greece to Italy.

P. 285, n. 61, *for* Æn. vii. 51-4, *read* Æn. viii. 51-4.

P. 203, n. 24. Compare Enn. Ann. i. 29, ed. Vahlen.

> Assaraco natus Capys optimus, isque pium ex se
> Anchisen generat.

P. 311, n. 54. Pausan. viii. 22, § 3, says that Caphyæ evidently derived its name from Cepheus, the son of Aleus; who was a mythical king of Tegea, and one of the Argonauts. See Apollon. Rhod. i. 161-3. It appears therefore that the first syllable of Caphyæ was long, whereas the first syllable of Capys was short.

P. 316, n. 75. Concerning Dido, see Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. iii. p. 458.

P. 320, n. 92. A nation near the Po, which wore black clothing, is mentioned by Polyb. ii. 16. This custom was said to be a token of grief for the death of Phaethon. Concerning the Scythian Melanchlæni, see Herod. iv. 107.

P. 322, n. 100, *for* Bell. Goth. ii. 22, *read* Bell. Goth. iv. 22.

P. 324. On the visit of Æneas to the Cuman Sibyl in her cave, see Agath. Hist. i. 10.

P. 328, n. 124. O. Müller, Kleine Schriften, vol. i. p. 215, thinks that when Æschylus calls the Tyrrhenians a *φαρμακοποιὸν ἔθνος* (fragm. 428, ed. Dindorf.), he attributes this property to them merely on account of Circe, who was supposed to dwell on the shores of the Tyrrhenian sea.

P. 343, n. 198. Massilia possessed a copy of Homer, of such antiquity and authority, that its readings were cited by the Alexandrine grammarians, who established the received text of Homer: see Wolf, Prol. Hom. § 39; Gräfenhan, Gesch. der Kl. Philol. vol. i. p. 276. Seven copies from Greek cities were used by the Alexandrine grammarians; namely, the Chian, Argive, Cyprian, Cretan, Æolian, Massilian, and Sinopian.

P. 348, n. 207. The conjecture of Schmidt (Didymi Fragmenta, p. 385, Lips. 1854), who alters the text of Seneca into 'de Æneæ *morte* verâ,' is not needed.

P. 350, n. 214. The lyre of Paris was shown at Troy in the time of Alexander the Great; Plut. Alex. 15.

P. 363, n. 32. *After* 7. Nomentum, *insert* 8. Pometia.

P. 372, last line of text, *for* or less, *read* nor less.

P. 390, n. 108. On the augury of Romulus, see Ennius, Ann. i. 57, ed. Vahlen.

P. 398, n. 140. See Vahlen, Enn. Poes. Reliq. p. xxxi.

P. 424, n. 55. In the passage of Stobæus, the *ψέλλια* and *ὅρμοι* bargained for by Demonice appear to be the gold ornaments of the Gallic soldiers. The pseudo-Plutarch, who inserts the words *τῶν γυναικῶν*, and refers them to the ornaments of the Ephesian women, has probably misconstrued the meaning of Clitophon.

P. 431, n. 82, *for* Camill. 32, *read* Camill. 33.

P. 451, n. 136. Compare Aristoxenus, fragm. 4, 5, 23; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. ii. p. 272.

P. 452, n. 137. The statement respecting the introduction of coined money by Numa, and his calling it after his name, reappears in Joann. Antiochen. § 33; Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. iv. p. 553; and Cedrenus, vol. i. p. 260. ed. Bonn. It is stated in Syncellus, vol. i. p. 398; Chron. Pasch. vol. i. p. 218, that he gave a congiarium, or gratuitous distribution, consisting of wooden, leathern, and earthenware money.

P. 453, n. 140, *for* Plut. Num. 6, *read* Plut. Num. 3.

P. 459, n. 136. Compare Serv. Æn. ii. 313, 486.

P. 465, n. 181. Serv. Æn. vi. 816, derives the name Ancus from ἀγκὼν, because he had a crooked arm.

P. 470, n. 2. Demaratus, one of the nobles of Corinth, left the town on account of the civil conflicts, and carried so much wealth with him to Tuscany, that he became the ruler of the city which received him. His son was afterwards king of Rome; Strabo, viii. 6, § 20.

P. 471, n. 3. See in Ælian. V. H. xiii. 33, Strab. xvii. 1, § 33, the story of the eagle which carried away the sandal of the courtesan Rhodopis, and dropped it in the lap of Psammetichus, as he was administering justice. The king caused the owner of it to be sought out, and made her his wife.

P. 476, l. 6, *for* Attius Navius, *read* Attus Navius.

P. 492, l. 18, *for* 82,700, *read* 84,700.

P. 508, n. 101. Concerning the Porta Scelerata, see below, vol. ii. p. 145.

P. 508, n. 103, *for* regnum, *read* regum.

P. 522, l. 23, *read* 'and the prophecy.'

END OF VOL. I.

LONDON:
SAVILL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

STANDARD BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

JOHN W. PARKER & SON, LONDON.

Oxford Essays, written by Members of the University. Octavo. 7s. 6d.

Contents:

Lucretius and the Poetic Characteristics of his Age. By W. Y. Sellar, late Fellow of Oriel College.

Suggestions on the best means of Teaching English History. By J. A. Froude, late Fellow of Exeter College.

Alfred de Musset. By F. T. Palgrave, Fellow of Exeter College.

The Plurality of Worlds. By Henry J. S. Smith, Fellow of Balliol College.

Persian Literature. By E. B. Cowell, Magdalen Hall.

Crime and its Excuses. By the Rev. W. Thomson, Fellow of Queen's College.

The Neighbourhood of Oxford and its Geology. By John Phillips, F.R.S., F.G.S., Deputy Reader of Geology.

Hegel's Philosophy of Right. By T. C. Sandars, late Fellow of Oriel College.

Oxford Studies. By the Rev. M. Pattison, Fellow of Lincoln College.

Cambridge Essays, written by Members of the University. Octavo.

History of England during the Reign of George the Third. By W. Massey, M.P. Vol. I. 12s.

Annotated Edition of the English Poets. By Robert Bell. In monthly volumes. 2s. 6d., in cloth.

Dryden. Three Volumes. 7s. 6d.

Cowper. With Selections from Lloyd, Cotton, Brooke, Darwin, and Hayley. Three Volumes. 7s. 6d.

Surrey, Minor Contemporaneous Poets, and Lord Buckhurst. 2s. 6d.

Songs from the Dramatists. 2s. 6d.

Sir Thomas Wyatt. 2s. 6d.

John Oldham. 2s. 6d.

Edmund Waller. 2s. 6d.

Chaucer. Vols. I., II., and III. 2s. 6d. each.

Thomson. Two Volumes. 5s.

Companions of my Solitude. Cheaper Edition. 2s. 6d.

Friends in Council. Cheaper Edition. Two Vols. 9s.

Essays written in Intervals of Business. Sixth Edition. 5s.

Of the Plurality of Worlds: an Essay. Fourth Edition. 6s.

A Year with the Turks. By Warington W. Smyth, M.A. With Map. 8s.

The Mediterranean: a Memoir, Physical, Historical, and Nautical. By Admiral Smyth. 15s.

Cloister Life of Charles the Fifth. By W. Stirling, M.P. Third Edition. 8s.

Velazquez and his Works. By W. Stirling, M.P. 5s.

Annals of the Artists of Spain. By W. Stirling, M.P. Three Vols. £3 3s.

Principles of Political Economy. By J. Stuart Mill. Third Edition. Two Volumes. Octavo. 30s.

System of Logic. By the same. Cheaper Edition. Two Volumes. 25s.

Goethe's Opinions on Mankind, Literature, Science, and Art. 3s. 6d.

An Inquiry into the Credibility of the Early Roman History. By Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, Bart., M.P. Two Vols.

On the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics. By Sir G. C. Lewis, Bart., M.P. Two Volumes. 28s.

On the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion. By the same. 10s. 6d.

History of the Whig Ministry of 1830, to the passing of the Reform Bill. By J. A. Roebuck, M.P. Two Vols. 28s.

History of Normandy and of England By Sir F. Palgrave. Vol. I. 21s.

History of Trial by Jury. By W. Forsyth, M.A. Octavo. 8s. 6d.

Introductory Lectures on Political Economy. By R. Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. Fourth Edition. 8s.

The Institutes of Justinian; with English Introduction, Translation, and Notes. By T. C. Sandars, M.A., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Octavo. 15s.

Varronianus; a Critical and Historical Introduction to the Ethnography of Ancient Italy, and the Philological Study of the Latin Language. By J. W. Donaldson, D.D., Head Master of Bury School. Second Edition, enlarged. 14s.

The New Cratylus; Contributions towards a more accurate Knowledge of the Greek Language. By Dr. Donaldson. Second Edition, enlarged. 18s.

Ancient and Modern Fish Tattle. By the Rev. C. D. Badham, M.D. 12s.

Leaves from the Note-Book of a Naturalist. By W. J. Broderip, F.R.S. 10s. 6d.

Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge. By Professor Sedgwick, M.A. Fifth Edition, 12s.

Lectures on Education, delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By

Dr. Whewell. | Professor Tyndall.
Prof. Faraday. | Mr. Paget.
Dr. G. R. Latham. | Dr. W. B. Hodgson.
Dr. Daubeny.

One Volume. 6s.

Elements of Logic. By R. Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 4s. 6d. Octavo, 10s. 6d.

Elements of Rhetoric. By the same Author. 4s. 6d. Octavo, 10s. 6d.

History of the Inductive Sciences. By W. Whewell, D.D., F.R.S., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Second Edition, revised. Three Vols. £2 2s.

Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences. By the same Author. Second Edition. Two Volumes. Octavo. 30s.

Indications of the Creator—Extracts from Dr. Whewell's History and Philosophy of Inductive Sciences. 5s. 6d.

On the Union of the Dominions of Great Britain, by Inter-communication with the Pacific and the East. By Captain M. H. Synge, R.E. With Maps. 3s. 6d.

Manual of Geographical Science. Part the First, 10s. 6d., containing—

MATHEMATICAL GEOGRAPHY. By Rev. M. O'Brien.

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY By T. D. Ansted, M.A., F.R.S.

CHARTOGRAPHY. By J. R. Jackson, F.R.S.

THEORY OF DESCRIPTION AND GEOGRAPHICAL TERMINOLOGY. By Rev. C. G. Nicolay.

Atlas of Physical and Historical Geography. Engraved by J. W. Lowry. 5s.

Elements of Morality. By Dr. Whewell. Third Edition. Two Vols. 15s.

Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy in England. By Dr. Whewell. 8s.

Lectures on Systematic Morality. By Dr. Whewell. 7s. 6d.

History of the Royal Society, compiled from Original Authentic Documents. By C. R. Weld, Assistant-Secretary of the Royal Society. Two Volumes. 30s.

The Comets; a Descriptive Treatise, with a condensed account of modern discoveries, and a table of all calculated Comets. By J. Russell Hind. 5s. 6d.

An Astronomical Vocabulary. By the same Author. 1s. 6d.

Cycle of Celestial Objects. By Admiral W. H. Smyth. Two Vols. With Illustrations. £3 2s.

Elements of Chemistry — Theoretical and Practical. By William Allen Miller, M.D., F.R.S., Professor of Chemistry, King's College, London. Part I. With 200 Illustrations. 10s. 6d.

Manual of Chemistry. By W. T. Brande, F.R.S. Sixth Edition, much enlarged. Two large volumes. £2 5s.

Dictionary of Materia Medica and Pharmacy. By the same Author. 15s.

Principles of Mechanism. By R. Willis, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy, Cambridge. 15s.

Mechanics applied to the Arts. By H. Moseley, M.A., F.R.S., one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. 6s. 6d.

Lectures on Astronomy. By same Author. Cheaper Edition, revised. 3s. 6d.

Elements of Meteorology. By the late Professor Daniell. With Plates. Two Volumes. Octavo. 32s.

On Thunder Storms, and on the Means of Protecting Buildings and Shipping against the Effects of Lightning. By Sir W. Snow Harris, F.R.S. 10s. 6d.

Connexion of Natural and Divine Truth. By Baden Powell, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Geometry, Oxford. 9s.

Undulatory Theory as applied to the Dispersion of Light. By the same. 9s.

Lectures on the Principles and Practice of Physic. By T. Watson, M.D. Third Edition. Two Volumes. Octavo. 34s.

On the Diseases of the Kidney: their Pathology, Diagnosis, and Treatment. By George Johnson, M.D., Assistant-Physician to King's College Hospital. 14s.

On the Structure and Functions of the Human Spleen. The Astley Cooper Prize for 1853. By Henry Gray, F.R.S., Demonstrator of Anatomy at St. George's Hospital. With 64 Illustrations. 15s.

Sanitary Condition of the City of London (from 1848 to 1853). With Preface and Notes. By John Simon, F.R.S., Surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital. 3s. 6d.

Physiological Anatomy and Physiology of Man. By Dr. Todd and W. Bowman, F.R.S. Part IV., Section I. 7s. Part III. 7s. Vol. I. 15s.

On Medical Evidence and Testimony in Cases of Lunacy. By T. Mayo, M.D., F.R.S. 3s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Living. By Herbert Mayo, M.D. Cheaper Edition. 5s.

Management of the Organs of Digestion. By the same. 6s. 6d.

Lunacy and Lunatic Life, with Hints on the Personal Care and Management of those afflicted with Derangement. 3s. 6d.

German Mineral Waters: and their rational Employment for the Cure of certain Chronic Diseases. By S. Sutro, M.D., Physician of the German Hospital. 7s. 6d.

Spasm, Languor, and Palsy. By J. A. Wilson, M.D. 7s.

Gout, Chronic Rheumatism, and Inflammation of the Joints. By R. B. Todd, M.D., F.R.S. 7s. 6d.

Minerals and their Uses. By J. R. Jackson, F.R.S. With Frontispiece. 7s. 6d.

Lectures on Dental Physiology and Surgery. By J. Tomes, F.R.S. Octavo. With 100 Illustrations. 12s.

Use and Management of Artificial Teeth. By the same Author. 3s. 6d.

Practical Geology and Mineralogy. By Joshua Trimmer, F.G.S. Octavo. With 200 Illustrations. 12s.

Practical Chemistry for Farmers and Landowners. By the same Author. 5s.

Practical Geodesy. By Butler Williams, C.E. New Edition, with Chapters on Estate, Parochial, and Railroad Surveying. With Illustrations. 8s. 6d.

Manual for Teaching Model-Drawing; with a Popular View of Perspective. By the same. With Engravings. 15s.

Instructions in Drawing. Abridged from the above. 3s.

Chemistry of the Four Ancient Elements. By T. Griffiths. 4s. 6d.

Recreations in Chemistry. By the same. Second Edition, enlarged. 5s.

Recreations in Physical Geography. By Miss R. M. Zornlin. Fifth Edition. 6s.

World of Waters; or, Recreations in Hydrology. By the same Author. 6s.

Recreations in Geology. By Miss R. M. Zornlin. Third Edition. 4s. 6d.

Recreations in Astronomy. By Rev. L. Tomlinson, M.A. Third Edition. 4s. 6d.

Guyot's Earth and Man; or, Physical Geography in Relation to the History of Mankind. Cheap Edition. 2s.

Summer Time in the Country. By Rev. R. A. Willmott. Second Edition. 5s.

Shipwrecks of the Royal Navy. By W. O. S. Gilly. With Preface by Dr. Gilly. 7s. 6d.

Danger of Superficial Knowledge. By Professor J. D. Forbes. 2s.

Meliora; or, Better Times to Come. Edited by Viscount Ingestre. Two Series. 5s. each.

Introductory Lectures delivered at Queen's College, London. 5s.

Days and Hours. By Frederick Tennyson. 6s.

The Angel in the House. 6s.

The Saint's Tragedy. By C. Kingsley, Rector of Eversley. Cheaper Edition. 2s.

Justin Martyr, and other Poems. By R. C. Trench, B.D. Third Edition. 6s.

Poems from Eastern Sources: Genoveva and other Poems. By the same. 5s. 6d.

Elegiac Poems. By the same. 2s. 6d.

The Poems of Goethe. Translated by Edgar A. Bowring. 7s. 6d.

Schiller's Poems, Complete. Translated by Edgar Alfred Bowring. 6s.

Songs and Idyls. By F. T. Palgrave, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 3s. 6d.

General Bounce; or, the Lady and the Locusts. By G. J. Whyte Melville. Two Volumes. 15s.

Gwen; or, the Cousins. By A. M. Goodrich. Two Volumes. 9s.

Heartsease; or, the Brother's Wife. By the Author of *The Heir of Redclyffe.* Third Edition. Two Volumes. 12s.

Light and Shade; or, the Young Artist. By Anna H. Drury. 6s.

Friends and Fortune. By Anna H. H. Drury. Second Edition. 6s.

The Inn by the Sea-Side. By Anna H. Drury. An Allegory. 2s.

Hypatia; or, New Foes with an Old Face. By C. Kingsley, Rector of Eversley. Two Volumes. 18s.

Digby Grand; an Autobiography. By G. J. Whyte Melville. Two Vols. 18s.

Heir of Redclyffe. Cheap Edition. 6s.

Yeast: a Problem. By C. KINGSLEY, Rector of Eversley. Cheaper Edition. 5s.

The Upper Ten Thousand: Sketches of American Society. By A NEW YORKER. 5s.

Clara Morison: A Tale of South Australia during the Gold Fever. Two Volumes. 9s.

The Youth and Womanhood of Helen Tyrrel. By the Author of *Brampton Rectory*. 6s.

Brampton Rectory; or, the Lesson of Life. Second Edition. 8s. 6d.

Compton Merivale. By the Author of *Brampton Rectory*. 8s. 6d.

The Cardinal Virtues; or, Morals and Manners Connected. By HARRIETTE CAMPBELL. Two Volumes. 7s.

The Merchant and the Friar; or, Truths and Fictions of the Middle Ages. By Sir F. PALGRAVE. Second Edition. 3s.

The Little Duke. By the Author of *Heartsease*. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.

Crusaders; Scenes, Events, and Characters from the Times of the Crusades. By T. KEIGHTLEY. 7s.

The Lord and the Vassal; a Familiar Exposition of the Feudal System. 2s.

French Revolution; its Causes and Consequences. By F. M. ROWAN. 3s. 6d.

Labaume's History of Napoleon's Invasion of Russia. 2s. 6d.

Historical Sketch of the British Army. By G. R. GLEIG, M.A., Chaplain-General to the Forces. 3s. 6d.

Family History of England. By the same Author. Cheaper Edition. Three Volumes. 10s. 6d.

Familiar History of Birds. By E. STANLEY, D.D., Bishop of Norwich. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.

Domesticated Animals. By MARY ROBERTS. Cheaper Edition. 2s. 6d.

Wild Animals. By the same Author. Cheaper Edition. 2s. 6d.

Popular Physiology. By P. B. LORD, M.B. Cheaper Edition, revised. 5s.

Amusements in Chess. By C. TOMLINSON. 4s. 6d.

Musical History, Biography, and Criticism. By GEORGE HOGARTH. Two Volumes. 10s. 6d.

Chronicles of the Seasons. In Four Books, 3s. 6d. each.

Ullmann's Gregory of Nazianzum. A Contribution to the Ecclesiastical History of the Fourth Century. Translated by G. V. COX, M.A. 6s.

Neander's Julian the Apostate and his Generation: an Historical Picture. Translated by G. V. COX, M.A. 3s. 6d.

Dahlmann's Life of Herodotus. Translated by G. V. COX, M.A. 5s.

Student's Manual of Ancient History. By W. COOKE TAYLOR, LL.D. Sixth and Cheaper Edition. 6s.

Student's Manual of Modern History. By the same. Fifth Edition. 10s. 6d.

History of Mohammedanism. Cheaper Edition. By the same Author. 4s.

History of Christianity. By the same Author. 6s. 6d.

Hellas: the Home, History, Literature, and Arts of the Ancient Greeks. By F. JACOBS. Translated by J. OXENFORD. 4s. 6d.

Analysis of Grecian History. By DAWSON W. TURNER, M.A., Head Master of the Royal Institution, Liverpool. 2s.

Analysis of Roman History. By the same Author. Second Edition. 2s.

Analysis of English and of French History. By the same. Third Edition. 2s.

Claudius Ptolemy and the Nile; or, an Inquiry into that Geographer's merit and errors, and the authenticity of the Mountains of the Moon. By W. D. COOLEY. With a Map. 4s.

The Holy City. By G. WILLIAMS, B.D. Second Edition, with Illustrations and Additions, and a Plan of Jerusalem. Two Vols. £2 5s.

History of the Holy Sepulchre. By PROFESSOR WILLIS. Reprinted from Williams's 'Holy City.' With Illustrations. 9s.

Plan of Jerusalem, from the Ordnance Survey. With a Memoir. Reprinted from Williams's 'Holy City.' 9s.

Three Weeks in Palestine and Lebanon. Cheaper Edition. 2s.

Notes on German Churches. By Dr. WHEWELL. Third Edition. 12s.

The Six Colonies of New Zealand. By W. FOX. 3s. With large Map. 4s. 6d.

Handbook for New Zealand. 6s.

View of the Art of Colonization. By E. GIBBON WAKEFIELD. Octavo. 12s.

Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand Greeks. By W. F. AINSWORTH. 7s. 6d.

4579
67

3 2044 009 631 318

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

WIDE[illegible]ER
BOO[illegible]
DE[illegible]